today to the unlawful search and seizure of the American-flag ships *Arctic Maid* and *Santa Ana* by Ecuador, I believe it desirable to extend my remarks to include additional information which I obtained from the Department of State.

Only a few short weeks ago, Mr. Nick Bez, of Seattle, Wash., a well-known fishing operator and a constituent of mine, paid $5,000 tribute to the Government of Peru for the release of his ships, the *Western Clipper* and the *Tony Bee*. Both of these ships asked sanctuary of the Peruvian Government, one for needed emergency repairs and the other for medical assistance for a sick crewman. After granting asylum to these fishing vessels and their crews, and literally inviting them into the protection of the harbor of Calloa, the Government of Peru seized the ships and to all intents and purposes held them for ransom. Three weeks ago eight American-flag fishing craft were seized, again by the Peruvian Government, and $2,000 more American ransom dollars were paid out before their release could be effected. On September 4, 1954, the *Sunstreak*, an American-flag ship owned by Mr. Jack Crivello, of San Diego, was confiscated by Ecuador. Mr. Crivello paid between $12,000 and $13,000 for the release of his ship, and, pursuant to Public Law 680 of the 83d Congress, has filed a claim in this connection with the Department of State.

These are acts of piracy, Mr. Speaker. Therefore I ask, how long will these acts of modern-day banditry be tolerated? How long will citizens of this country sailing under the protection of the Stars and Stripes be subjected to the indignities of forcible detention by foreign governments until tribute is paid for their release? I suggest that it is about time the United States ceased protesting and started protecting our American persons and property. The echoes of that stirring slogan of early years, "Millions for defense but not 1 cent for tribute," once echoed loudly in this land of freedom. In our position of world leadership it should resound from shore to shore, today louder and with far greater determination and firmness than ever before in our history.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1955

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)

The Senate met in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, beyond whose brooding care we cannot drift: In the glory and vigor of a new morning we lift our careworn hearts to Thee, as we set our faces once more toward waiting tasks and toils. We fain would quiet our souls in Thy presence and rest ourselves in the confidence of Thy sustaining strength, that the peace of God which passeth all understanding may guard our hearts and thoughts. Through countless channels Thou dost seek our lives. At many a door Thou dost stand and knock, if we would but heed the gentle accents of Thy call.

In all the strident voices of this tumultuous day may we not miss the still, small voice which alone can change our fear to faith and our cowardice to courage. Hearken to the prayers of our hearts when in our highest moments we forget ourselves and think of Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 16, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 913) to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3322. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes; and

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document the pamphlet, Our American Government, What Is It? How Does it Function?;

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a report on the Prayer Room established in the Capitol;

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings held by the Committee on Government Operations on the organization and administration of the military research and development programs; and

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 210 of the 83d Congress.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3322) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following House concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

House Concurrent Resolution 85

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the author of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?", as set out in House Document No. 465, 79th Congress, and subsequent editions thereof, revise the same, bring it up to date, and that it be printed as a public document.

SEC. 2. Such revised pamphlet shall be printed as a House document, and there shall be printed 300,000 additional copies, of which 24,750 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; 266,150 for the use of the House of Representatives; 3,100 for the Senate Document Room; and 6,000 for the House Document Room.

House Concurrent Resolution 90

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to prepare a report on the origin, establishment, furnishing, and decoration of the Prayer Room established by House Concurrent Resolution 60 of the 83d Congress for use of the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. Such report shall be printed as a House document with illustrations, in accordance with regulations of the Joint Committee on Printing. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed 100 copies for use and distribution by each Member of Congress.

SEC. 3. As used in this resolution, the term "Member of Congress" includes a Member of the Senate, a Member of, and a Delegate to, the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO CERTAIN REORGANIZATION PLANS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2576) to further

amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 17, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 942) to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold."

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

As in legislative session,

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee on Investigation of Union Welfare and Pension Funds of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in order to expedite the work of the Committee on Appropriations in the remaining months of the present session of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be permitted to meet when necessary during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, with statements made in connection therewith limited to not exceeding 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have asked the minority leader to give consideration to the possibility of the Senate's taking up today Calendar No. 107, a bill (S. 1325) to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; Calendar No. 108, a bill (S. 1326) to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; Calendar No. 109, a bill (S. 1327) to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; Calendar No. 110, a bill (S. 1436) to preserve the tobacco acreage history of farms which voluntarily withdraw from the production of tobacco, and for other purposes; and Calendar No. 111, a bill (S. 1457) to redetermine the national marketing quotas for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes.

I understand those bills have been reported unanimously from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and that there is no opposition to them. It may be that after concluding the business scheduled for today I shall desire to move the consideration of those bills.

I wished to make that announcement at this time.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 14)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the Federal Civil Defense Administration, in the amount of $12 million, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CADETS APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the number of cadets that the President may personally select for appointment to the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS IN EXCESS OF $50,000 AWARDED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth semiannual report of contracts, in excess of $50,000, for research, development, and experimental purposes, awarded by the Department of the Navy, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION ON TIN OPERATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of that Corporation on tin operations, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration, as of June 30, 1954, including the annual report of the Veterans' Educational Appeals Board, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

GAIN FROM SALE OR EXCHANGE OF PROPERTY REQUIRED BY FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a problem which has arisen as a result of that Commission's obligations under section 1071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the gain from the sale or exchange of certain property; to the Committee on Finance.

JOURNAL OF SENATE OF TERRITORY OF HAWAII

A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Journal of the Senate, Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, special session of 1954 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMISSION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA (H. Doc. No. 110)

A letter from the chief scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, National Council, New Brunswick, N. J., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 45th Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the con-

duct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

COVER ON MAIL OF SENATORS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letter from the Assistant Attorney General, which was read, and, with the accompanying exhibits, was ordered to be placed on file:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, March 17, 1955.

Hon. FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: Your memorandum of March 10, 1955, directing the report of the Special Committee on Investigation of Cover on Mail of Senators to the attention of the Attorney General for appropriate action has been referred to the Criminal Division.

The material transmitted has been examined and found to be essentially the same as that made available to us by United States Senator CARL HAYDEN under cover of his letter dated December 14, 1954. Senator HAYDEN requested at that time that he be advised whether there was any violation of Federal law based upon the facts and evidence adduced. We advised Senator HAYDEN in a letter of January 5, 1955, that we had concluded from our examination of the materials in the light of the applicable law that the mail cover did not violate any Federal criminal statute. Upon a reexamination of our file in the light of the material submitted with your memorandum, we have reached the same conclusion.

We are returning the original exhibits forwarded with your memorandum.

Sincerely,

WARREN OLNEY III,
Assistant Attorney General.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"A concurrent resolution petitioning the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Department of Defense to appoint a committee to investigate and study the proposed closing of Camp Kilmer and to defer closing of this military establishment until completion of such investigation

"Whereas the Department of Defense has announced that it intends to close the military establishment known as Camp Kilmer located in Middlesex County in the State of New Jersey on or about June 30, 1955; and

"Whereas the Federal Government acquired approximately 1,900 acres of land in the establishment of Camp Kilmer, adversely affecting the ratables in several municipalities; and

"Whereas the area adjacent to the military installation has undergone a period of economic adjustment and large capital investments have been made in order to anticipate the needs of Camp Kilmer and its personnel; and

"Whereas the closing of Camp Kilmer will result in great economic dislocation in this defense area: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the General Assembly concurring):*

"1. It is respectfully requested that Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, or Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, appoint a committee composed of representatives of the Federal Government as well as citizens from the community to investigate and study the proposed closing of the military establishment known as Camp Kilmer in Middlesex County and that the closing of Camp Kilmer be deferred until such committee has had an opportunity to study and submit a report.

"2. The secretary of the senate is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, to the respective presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in the Congress.

"3. This concurrent resolution shall take effect immediately.

"BRUCE A. WALLACE,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"O. J. VAN CAMP,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 10

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Director of Fish and Wildlife Service, and Territorial Delegate to Congress:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas reindeer stations and wildlife refuges withdrawn from public entry by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Fish and Wildlife Service are closed to mining and prospecting in Alaska; and

"Whereas these particular withdrawals total more than 8 million acres; and

"Whereas many known deposits of lode and placer gold, strategic and industrial minerals, and coal exist within these withdrawn areas; and

"Whereas in the case of St. Lawrence Island, which is withdrawn as a reindeer station, only approximately 90 head of reindeer exist and more cannot be supported there for 50 to 100 years in the future because of extreme overgrazing in the past and the slow growth of the lichens and moss on which they feed; and

"Whereas mining operations on St. Lawrence Island, which is usually a hardship area, would create employment opportunities for the native Eskimos and aid their economy; and

"Whereas in the case of the large wildlife refuges on Kodiak Island, the Aleutian Islands, and the Kenai Peninsula, orderly prospecting and mining could be carried on without disturbing the wildlife under protection and with no conflict with the control or regulations of the Fish and Wildlife Service as is done in some wildlife refuges in the States.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that these withdrawn lands be opened to prospecting and mining by the respective agencies concerned.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 24, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house March 4, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 15

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America; the Honorable Richard Nixon, President of the United States Senate; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; the Honorable Carl Hayden, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations; the Honorable Clarence Cannon, chairman, House Committee on Appropriations; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the people of Alaska desire to attract new industry and new population to the Territory, to develop Alaska's economy to a high level, resulting in a higher standard of living and the creation of taxable treasure through utilization of natural resources; and

"Whereas Wood Canyon on the Copper River, the largest remaining undeveloped hydroelectric power site on the Pacific coast of the United States, has been under investigation during the past few years; and

"Whereas development of the Wood Canyon power site would attract and permit the establishment of aluminum and/or other light metals industries and other large consumers of low-cost hydroelectric energy in the electrochemical and electrometallurgical fields; and

"Whereas copper deposits in the region are not being worked during a period of serious copper shortages throughout the free world owing to the lack of surface transportation to Cordova, Alaska, a year-round, deepwater seaport; and

"Whereas the Katalla petroleum province, also adjacent to Cordova, cannot be explored adequately, or brought into actual production without construction of an access road link with Cordova; and

"Whereas the Bering River coalfield, estimated to cover more than 50 square miles and to contain more than 2 billion tons of coal ranging in rank from subbituminous to anthracite, including unknown quantities of metallurgical-grade coking coal, remains undeveloped because no highway links the coalfield with port facilities at Cordova; and

"Whereas it already has been demonstrated that construction of the Copper River Highway not only is feasible from the engineering standpoint, but also may be placed in the low-cost construction category since use of the abandoned Copper River and Northwestern Railroad bed, including several steel bridges which are in good condition, are involved; and

"Whereas the 109-mile right-of-way is the property of the United States Government; and

"Whereas construction of the Copper River Highway would provide an alternative route from the Gulf of Alaska to defense installations in interior Alaska, important to the defense scheme of the Territory.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully urges that the construction program of the Copper River Highway, now under way on a piecemeal basis, be accelerated to permit development of resources of the region at the earliest possible moment.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 4, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate March 8, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the traffic managers conference of southern California, Los Angeles, Cal., signed by F. Z. Wakefield, president, embodying a resolution adopted by that conference, relating to the fiscal and financial policies of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Mary J. Richards, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Highway Officials of North Atlantic States, at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to the Federal aid for highways program; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"A concurrent resolution requesting the two United States Senators and the United States Congressmen from the Second and Third Districts of South Carolina to investigate the possibility of obtaining Federal aid for property owners in Aiken, Edgefield, McCormick, and Saluda Counties who suffered losses as a result of the wind and hail storm on the night of March 13–14

"Whereas property owners in Aiken, Edgefield, McCormick, and Saluda Counties suffered severe losses to their crops and other property as a result of the wind and hail storm which struck with terrific force on the night of March 13–14; and

"Whereas many such property owners are without financial ability to repair and replace such losses: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the two United States Senators from South Carolina and the Members of the United States Congress from the Second and Third Congressional Districts are requested to investigate the possibility of obtaining Federal aid for the property owners in Aiken, Edgefield, McCormick, and Saluda Counties; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished the two United States Senators and the Members of the Congress of the United States from the Second and Third Congressional Districts."

REHABILITATION OF PAPAGO TRIBE OF INDIANS—RESOLUTION OF ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to the Papago Indian Reservation. The resolution recommends that a program be established for the rehabilitation of that tribe of Indians and the protection and better utilization of the resources of the tribe.

In this connection, Mr. President, I may state that there is pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a bill (S. 54) to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and the better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, introduced by my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and myself, which this memorial supports.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution, presented by Mr. HAYDEN, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

House Memorial 1

Memorial requesting Congress to create a program for the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians for the protection of and better utilization of the resources of the tribe

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

The Papago Tribe of Indians, located on the second largest reservation in the United States comprising almost 3 million acres in southern Arizona, is the only tribe of Indians on a reservation in the United States that does not have the right to minerals under the land.

This unfair condition exists in spite of the fact that the United States in the Gadsden Purchase Treaty in 1854 promised to protect the rights of the inhabitants of that area when it was transferred from Mexican to American sovereignty. This discrimination against the Papagos is the result of pressure brought on President Woodrow Wilson at the time in 1916 when he set aside the land for an Indian reservation. In 1932, acting upon representations made by attorneys for the Papagos, the then Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Ray L. Wilbur, closed the reservation to mineral entry. However, in 1934, a rider denying the Papagos the mineral rights was attached to the Indian reorganization bill. This has brought about a condition in which the Papagos face the prospect of losing their reservation piecemeal because both large companies and amateur prospectors are searching for uranium and other minerals on the Indian land. If a prospector can prove there is mineral under his stake, he can file a claim and work the land. Even sand and gravel claims can be filed.

In substantiation of this claim it might be pointed out that as of August 18, 1954, 410 mining claims encompassing over 11,000 acres of land had been located, and 202 claims encompassing almost 4,000 acres of Papago land had been patented.

In addition to this danger of losing their land through mining activities, the Papagos because of conditions beyond their control are in dire need of assistance from the Federal Government.

One of the main reasons stems from inadequate educational opportunities. The Papago Reservation at the present time has only 6 Government schools to provide educational opportunities for about 1,250 children. In addition the reservation supports 5 Catholic mission schools offering education to about 350 children, one-half of whom are taken care of by contract with the Federal Government on a tuition basis. This is necessary since the distances to Government schools are too great, in some instances as high as 20 miles, to allow all of these children to attend even by the use of buses. In addition to this deplorable situation, only the elementary grades are provided. There is no opportunity for these children to further their education on the reservation, in either high school or college, and such opportunities are extremely limited throughout the western United States.

Since 1947, when the hospital at Sells, Ariz., was destroyed by fire, there has been no hospital maintained on the Papago Reservation. The nearest adequate facilities are in Tucson, a distance of 60 miles from the center of the reservation, with the next nearest hospital being located in Phoenix, a distance of 145 miles. Only 2 outpatient clinics, the one at Sells and the other at Santa Rosa, and 1 mobile health unit operated by the United States Public Health Service, are available to care for the entire reservation of about 8,000 population, and these are severely handicapped by a lack of sufficient personnel. There are no obstetrical facilities on the entire reservation, with the result that the infant mortality rate on the Papago Reservation is the worst in the United States with about 1 of every 4 children dying during their first year, and the life expectancy at birth being about 20 years. The health situation is further complicated by the fact that there is no tuberculosis sanatorium on the reservation, and the death rate from this disease is about seven times greater than the average throughout the rest of the United States.

The Papago Indian Reservation is located in an extremely arid region. In spite of this there are only 143 wells serving the entire reservation for an average of less than one well for each village. The water from these few wells is carried for the most part by wagon in barrels for distances up to 5 miles. In some areas water is taken directly from open ponds and used for household purposes without boiling.

Nor does the irrigation problem stand in any better light, for there are only about 15,000 acres, or about one-half of 1 percent of the total acreage lying within the reservation which is irrigable land. This small amount can support only 200 families of the total 1,250 families living on the reservation.

Any one of the above circumstances would of itself be sufficient argument for immediate action by the Federal Government, but with the combination of unfortunate handling of mineral rights, inadequate educational opportunities, nonexistent hospital care and medical guidance, severe lack of water for both household and irrigation purposes, and poor roads, the situation of the Papago Indians is desperate beyond human conception.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, respectfully prays:

1. That the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona be closed to any further prospecting or locating of mineral claims, and that the Papago Indian Tribe be granted the same rights to minerals that other Indian tribes on reservations enjoy.

2. That a survey of the mineral resources of the Papago Indian Reservation be made by an agency of the Federal Government.

3. That sufficient funds be appropriated by Congress to create and make effective a comprehensive rehabilitation program to promote the economic and social development of the Papago Indians, such comprehensive program to include: 3 (a) More Government schools and teachers and the opportunity to attend high schools and colleges for Papago children; 3 (b) a 40- to 50-bed general hos-

pital at Sells, Ariz., together with provisions for adequate doctors, dentists, nurses, sanitoriums, mobile health units, ambulances, and administrative assistance to maintain adequate vital statistics; 3 (c) drilling and equipping of more wells both for household and irrigation purposes; 3 (d) more roads, and, 3 (e) in general, to provide facilities, employment, and essential services in combating hunger, disease, poverty, and demoralization among the members of the tribe, to make available the resources of the reservation for use in building up a self-supporting economy and self-reliant communities, and to lay a stable foundation upon which the Papagos can engage in diversified economic activities and ultimately attain standards of living comparable with those enjoyed by other citizens.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Whereas the attention of a world plagued with the imperialistic designs of godless communism is focused with foreboding on the next move of the Chinese Communists; and

"Whereas this move could take form in large-scale military aggression aimed at subjugation of Formosa, the Pescadores Islands, and related territory; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has asked the Congress for a grant of authority to employ United States Armed Forces as he sees fit in frustrating a possible Chinese Communist attempt to seize Formosa, the Pescadores Islands, and related territory; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States with but six dissenting votes has given its approval to the subject request, known as the Formosa resolution; and

"Whereas the greatest import of the Formosa resolution stems from its inherent influence as a deterrent to Chinese Communist aggression; and

"Whereas this influence will be felt in direct proportion to the degree of unanimity with which the Formosa resolution is upheld by the citizens of the United States of America and their elected officials, as well as the peoples of all free nations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring), That this 48th legislative assembly, in regular session assembled, hereby give its unequivocal backing to the action taken by the President and the Congress in their advocacy of the Formosa resolution; be it further

"Resolved, That all interested citizens of Oregon and all civil, fraternal, management, labor, veterans, and other organizations in this State hereby be urged likewise to apprise the President and the Congress of their concurrence in the Formosa resolution to the end that as many Americans as possible be united in expressing opposition to Chinese Communist designs on the territory in the western Pacific area in question; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon hereby be directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and the Oregon delegation to the Congress of the United States of America and to the appropriate representatives of press and radio who can assist in giving the viewpoint set forth in this resolution the widest possible dissemination.

"Adopted by senate February 3, 1955.

"ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
"Chief Clerk of Senate.
"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of Senate.

"Adopted by house February 9, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of House."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"To the Honorable Members from Oregon of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, and to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior for the United States of America:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas several years ago certain airlines were granted temporary authority by the Civil Aeronautics Board to establish and operate through air freight and passenger transportation service between Portland, Oreg., on the one hand, and Alaskan cities upon the other, pending a general investigation known as the States-Alaska case covering the issuance of permanent certificates authorizing such operations; and

"Whereas by reason of this through air transportation service, inaugurated and maintained by these airlines during the past several years, a vital pattern of trade and commerce has been developed as between the industries and businesses of the State of Oregon and the Territory of Alaska, and as a result Oregon industries and businesses are enjoying a rapidly increasing air cargo commerce with industries and businesses in Alaskan cities, while through passenger service is encouraging and building a close tie of friendly business relationship, and thus this service has proved to be an absolute necessity in the public interest; and

"Whereas during 1954 the Civil Aeronautics Board, in the course of their general investigation, caused public hearings to be held respecting the question of adequate air transportation service in the public interest between the United States and the Territory of Alaska, and at these hearings the business interests of the city of Portland and the State of Oregon, supported by the Public Utilities Commissioner of Oregon, intervened in support of a permanently maintained through air transportation service, both air cargo and passenger, between Portland, Oreg., and Alaskan cities, while Seattle business interests, supported by the Washington Public Service Commission, took a position favoring a monopoly of Alaskan air commerce by Seattle commercial interests in that they advocated that presently existing through air transportation operations between Portland, Oreg., and Alaskan cities should be done away with as uneconomical, and that all temporary airline certificates be rescinded, and that Seattle, Wash., should be permanently designated as the sole and exclusive terminal of all air commerce between the Territory of Alaska and the United States of America; and

"Whereas thereafter an initial decision was proposed by the Chief Hearing Examiner to the Civil Aeronautics Board recommending the granting of the request and contentions of Seattle business and commercial interests by the creation of a virtual monopoly of air trade and commerce in favor of Seattle, and limiting all through air-transportation service between the Territory of Alaska and the United States to the one single air terminal located in and near Seattle, Wash., and rescinding all temporary certificates held by airlines now serving Portland, Oreg., maintaining through air-transportation service between Portland and Alaskan cities, thereby slamming shut the door of trade and commerce between Alaska and the State of Oregon and strangling all competition which is the very essence and life of American commerce, all to the great detriment and loss of not only the businesses, industries, and the people generally of Oregon, but also to the detriment and loss of citizens of the Territory of Alaska and their new and growing industries; and

"Whereas presently existing air trade and commerce between the United States and the Territory of Alaska was found by the Civil Aeronautics Board investigation, through its Chief Hearing Examiner and staff, to be an absolute necessity in the public interest, as shown by the following quoted excerpts from the examiner's report:

" 'No Territory under the American flag is so dependent upon air transportation as the vast land area of Alaska. The last frontier of the United States contains a vast wealth of natural resources and is so located as to play a vital role in the defense plans of the Nation. Unlike other parts of the United States, there are no alternative modes of transportation in Alaska—the river boats and the dog team have, to a large part, been displaced by the airplane.

" 'Inadequate, unreliable, and high-cost shipping from the States to Alaska has played a large part in the development of the Territory as an area of high costs, with a consequent deterring effect upon its growth. In addition to the high transportation charges incurred in the transportation of cargo to Alaska, the uncertainties inherent in the system in the past have resulted in the necessity for maintaining unusually high inventories. The problem of spoilage in perishable products has been another problem resulting from the transportation lack. * * * Neither the sea route nor the highway route can offer a reasonably comparable service from standpoint of time, and both of these routings are of limited use during the winter months'; and

"Whereas it has been reliably reported that the membership of the Civil Aeronautics Board has finally adopted the detrimental recommendations of the Chief Hearing Examiner, basing their conclusions upon the concept that economy of operations demands a cessation of through air-transportation service between Portland, Oreg., and Alaskan cities, even though a strangling monopoly is created and established thereby in favor of Seattle businesses and industries, and despite the apparent fact that the public interest of Oregon will suffer great and irreparable damage while the Territory of Alaska becomes competitively shackled respecting its air trade and commerce with the United States; and

"Whereas if the aforesaid decision becomes the final decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board, all air transportation operations between Portland, Oreg., and Alaskan cities will be subject to the additional costs of terminal operations at Seattle, Wash., made necessary by the combination of local flights to Seattle with through flights from thence on to Alaskan cities, which will warrant necessary additional overhead costs of separate organization, separate billing and handling expense on air cargo, and under well recognized court decisions covering rates and charges for transportation, increased rate charges for these additional terminal services are justified, and it is obvious that any proposed shuttle service between Seattle and Portland, and thence by through service to Alaska, on all movements of air cargo, as well as passenger, will entail added rates and

charges which will have the effect of doing away entirely with any competitive aspects of air transportation, trade, and commerce as between Portland and Seattle in relation to the markets and cities of the Territory of Alaska: Be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior be hereby memorialized to bring this most vital transportation and economic situation to the attention of the honorable membership of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board, through established procedures, in behalf of the public interest of the people of the State of Oregon, to insure the protection of the public interest in Oregon, as well as the Territory of Alaska, and avert the grave economic consequences which will inevitably follow if an air trade and commerce monopoly is created in favor of the business and commercial interests of Seattle to the exclusion of the commercial and trade interests of the city of Portland, Oreg., by the establishment of through air transportation service as between Seattle, Wash., only, and Alaskan cities, while denying the same through air transportation service between Portland, Oreg., and Alaskan cities, in direct violation of the competitive principles of trade and commerce which is the very essence of the American system and way of life; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon, is hereby directed to present official copies of this memorial and resolution, through proper channels, to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Interior for their consideration and action relative to any decision which might throttle air trade and commerce as between Oregon and the Territory of Alaska, and create a virtual monopoly in behalf of Seattle, Wash., detrimental to the public interest of both the State of Oregon and the Territory of Alaska.

"Adopted by house February 1, 1955.

"Adopted by senate February 11, 1955.

"C. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of the House.
"EDITH BYRON LOW,
"Chief Clerk.
"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of the Senate."

RESOLUTION OF OREGON STATE FARMERS UNION, SALEM, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions, adopted by the Oregon State Farmers Union at Salem, Oreg., relating to income from offshore oil for education, and control and allocation of electric power in the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Whereas there is a movement by the private power utilities to promote the formation of the Columbia Interstate Compact Commission, including the States of Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, Montana, and Utah for the purpose of controlling or allocating the electric power in the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas it is feared this commission would be largely in control of the private utilities: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Oregon State Farmers Union go on record as being unalterably opposed to the formation of the so-called Columbia Interstate Compact Commission; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Oregon delegation in Congress."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolved, That we favor using the Federal income derived from offshore oil for education in accord with the bill introduced by Senator LISTER HILL of Alabama; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our representatives in Congress."

COLUMBIA RIVER INTERSTATE COMPACT—RESOLUTION OF OREGON STATE GRANGERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Oregon State Grangers at Portland, Oreg., relating to the Columbia River Interstate Compact.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Grangers, representing 34 of the State's 36 counties, meeting at State Grange headquarters in Portland, Oreg., on January 17, 1955, to discuss the hydrolectric power situation in the Pacific Northwest go on record in opposition to the Columbia Interstate Compact between the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Wyoming, and Utah, because this compact would draw arbitrary lines for the allocation of power and water rather than making it available on a regionwide basis.

The wording of the compact is confusing and we urge the Oregon State Legislature not to commit Oregon to this compact when it leaves so many questions unanswered.

We also oppose the compact because it will impede the orderly Federal development of the natural resources and the full hydroelectric power potential of the Pacific Northwest.

RAY W. GILL.
ALBERT ULLMAN.
EARL A. MOORE.

CLOSING OF VETERANS HOSPITALS TO CERTAIN NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY CASES—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Oregon, relating to the closing of Veterans hospitals to certain nonservice connected cases.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of Portland Chapter No. 1, Disabled American Veterans, that the head of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. Higley, has recently issued an order that no nonservice connected veteran shall hereafter be admitted to any Veterans Mental Hospital unless his mental or nervous disability shall be directly service connected; and

Whereas it is well known that any veteran afflicted with this disability requires long treatment and hospitalization under such circumstances and few if any of such veterans are financially able to pay for such long time treatment in a private hospital and as a consequence all such veterans will become a public charge to the local branches of the government and the Government is thus shirking and shifting this responsibility of the Government to the local communities who are not financially able to meet this drain upon their treasuries; and

Whereas there are now confined in the State hospitals a large number of veterans who should be receiving this treatment from the Government, in Government institutions and hospitals; and

Whereas the United States Government is gradually shifting this and other responsibilities of the Government to the local communities and thus placing a heavy drain upon the local taxpayers; and

Whereas only a short time ago this same Mr. Higley, head of the Veterans' Administration stated publicly that it was the responsibility of the Government to care for all nonservice connected cases wherein it would require a long period of time for their treatment, which statement is in direct contradiction to the order recently issued; and

Whereas the great cry of the Veterans' Administration as to why they cannot care for these cases is that they do not have sufficient hospital beds for such care; and

Whereas at the present time there is an order out to close the tuberculosis section of the Barnes Veterans Hospital which will make available approximately 150 beds which if properly staffed could be used for mental patients; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That Portland Chapter No. 1, DAV, go on record as asking the State legislature to petition or otherwise recommend to Congress and the Veterans' Administration, that the order closing Veteran hospitals to nonservice connected mental or nervous cases be rescinded and that the Congress of the United States be asked to construct or equip and staff additional buildings and hospitals in the northwest to care for such additional patients that are so rapidly adjudged being in need of such care, especially as many of these nonservice cases are borderline cases and in all probability a direct result of the stresses and strains suffered under combat and which are now showing up after a long period of time; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the joint legislative staff of the several veteran organizations and a copy to the State Department of the DAV and to each chapter in the department.

PORTLAND CHAPTER NO. 1, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS.

NATIONAL FLOWER OF THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Portland (Oreg.) Realty Board, favoring the selection of a national flower of the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the board of directors of the Portland Realty Board, in session this

16th day of February of the year 1955, go on record as unanimously approving the movement to select a national flower of the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Portland Realty Board hereby recommend that the rose be approved as the flower hereafter to be known as the national flower of the United States of America.

CHARLES L. PAINE,
President, Portland Realty Board.

Attested:

TAYLOR TREECE,
Executive Secretary, Portland Realty Board.

REORGANIZATION OF MILWAUKEE DISTRICT OFFICE, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was delighted to hear from Herbert Schirnas, secretary of the Milwaukee Post of the Society of American Military Engineers, of the desire of that distinguished organization for the retention of the Milwaukee District Office of the Corps of Engineers. Its retention is considered to be vital.

I present this important resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

I earnestly hope that the resolution's objective will indeed be attained.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has announced its plan of reorganization of the Milwaukee district office of the Corps of Engineers and the transfer to the Chicago, Detroit, and St. Paul offices of various responsibilities, duties, and personnel, all in the interest of economy and the attainment of even greater efficiency and value to the public than the high standard always merited by the corps, of which the Milwaukee district office was always a leader; and

Whereas we regret the need of the change in status of the Milwaukee district office, knowing of its long help and value to the port cities on Lake Michigan in both Wisconsin and Michigan, to engineering circles in all classes in both war and peace, and to shipping and economic groups in this powerful industrial and commercial area; and

Whereas we view with great pride the sterling record in the public welfare of the Milwaukee district office, which record is best described by one of our Nation's transportation leaders when he said, "I am amazed at the news that the district office of the Corps of Engineers is closing at Milwaukee. I certainly am sorry for I believe from the time I have known that office it is and has been one of the best engineering offices of the corps and did a great amount of good. It seems to me to be in a proper spot industrially and geographically for the work to be done in that area"; and

Whereas we hold in highest esteem the unmatched technical knowledge and sound judgment of the Corps of Engineers and recognize that the port cities and shipping routes now included in the present Milwaukee district will grow in use beyond estimate to the benefit of the people of both Wisconsin and Michigan: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Milwaukee post of the Society of American Military Engineers which in the 25 years of its existence worked with the Milwaukee district office in closest cooperation and highest confidence and esteem, express the belief and make the request that the Corps of Engineers continue its long confidence in, and service to, the Lake Michigan area presently in the Milwaukee district, and that the corps will continue in the Milwaukee area office such staff and such facilities as will permit a continuance of the great service and value which in the past won for the Milwaukee district office the high acclaim it received from all our people; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be placed in the hands of the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the States and districts in the present Milwaukee district, the Chief of Engineers, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the division engineer, north central division, and the district engineer for the Milwaukee district.

MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have heard from a great many veterans' organizations in protest against various recommendations which have been filed with the President, and which could result in harming the welfare of the Nation's veterans, particularly those in need of medical care.

I present one such grassroots resolution. It comes from a Veterans of Foreign Wars post in Spooner, Wis.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Spooner, Wis., March 14, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOSEPH MCCARTHY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. ALVIN O'KONSKI,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Our Veterans of Foreign Wars post is very much concerned because of the proposals by the Hoover Commission, and at our last regular meeting the following resolution was unanimously passed:

"*Resolved*, That Dodge-Gilbertson-Carlson Post 1028, Veterans of Foreign Wars, located at Spooner, Wis., is opposed to the Hoover Commission's proposal to close 21 veterans' hospitals and to curtail the veterans' pensions, for the reason that such proposal would create an undue and unnecessary hardship on all veterans concerned; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution in opposition to such proposal be forwarded to the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator, JOSEPH MCCARTHY, United States Senator, and Hon. ALVIN O'KONSKI, United States Congressman."

We earnestly solicit your concerted opposition to such proposal.

Respectfully,

LLOYD POTTERTON, *Commander.*
FRED SCHROEDER, *Quartermaster.*
HERMAN HUMMEL, *Adjutant.*

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY BILLS—LETTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Rev. Leland B. Henry, executive director for the department of Christian social relations, of the diocese of New York, a resolution urging a hearing on pending juvenile delinquency bills, one of which I was glad to cosponsor as a member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

I emphatically endorse the recommendation which was made on the occasion of a recent widely attended public conference on our responsibility to troubled children.

I feel sure that hearings will indeed be shortly held by the Senate Labor Committee on this score, and I hope they can be expedited to the greatest possible extent in the interest of starting constructive action on behalf of the Nation's youngsters.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Reverend Mr. Henry be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Labor Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNCIL OF THE
DIOCESE OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., March 15, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: At a conference on our responsibility to our troubled children, sponsored by the department of Christian social relations of the Episcopal diocese of New York, a resolution was unanimously adopted requesting that public hearings be held on two bills dealing with juvenile delinquency, namely, S. 728, introduced by Senator KEFAUVER and 19 other Senators, and S. 894, introduced by yourself and Senator THYE.

The conference numbered 600 people representing 9 dioceses of the Episcopal Church, and 59 voluntary agencies—Jewish, Protestant, and nonsectarian. Among those present were the attorney general of the State of New York, the chairman of the State youth commission, the presiding justice of the Children's Court of New York City and many of the outstanding leaders of the social agencies of New York. A copy of the program is enclosed.

The resolution requesting the hearings was offered by the Right Reverend Charles F. Boynton, suffragan bishop of New York. It was adopted with enthusiasm, and represents the considered judgment of hundreds of concerned, responsible citizens.

Respectfully yours,

LELAND B. HENRY,
Executive Director.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1166. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 30, 1890, as amended, and section 2 of the act of February 2, 1903, as amended (Rept. No. 114); and

S. 1167. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (Rept. No. 115).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of January 1955 and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, together with a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JANUARY 1955 AND DECEMBER 1954, AND PAY, DECEMBER AND NOVEMBER 1954

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for January 1955 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In January numbered—	In December numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In December was—	In November was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,353,573	2,368,072	−14,499	$904,338	$782,372	+$121,966
Agencies exlusive of Department of Defense	1,170,191	1,188,166	−17,975	485,997	403,005	+82,992
Department of Defense	1,183,382	1,179,906	+3,476	418,341	379,367	+38,974
Inside continental United States	2,126,014	2,141,109	−15,095			
Outside continental United States	227,559	226,963	+596			
Industrial employment	725,396	728,132	−2,736			
Foreign nationals	341,517	340,272	+1,245	26,394	25,133	+1,261

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1955, and comparison with December 1954, and pay for December 1954, and comparison with November 1954*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	70,920	70,348	572		24,053	23,424	629	
Commerce [1]	44,466	63,386		18,920	22,579	17,939	4,640	
Health, Education, and Welfare	37,918	[2] 36,676	1,242		14,257	[2] 13,352	905	
Interior	49,543	[2] 49,842		299	19,590	19,019	571	
Justice	30,303	30,249	54		13,806	12,965	841	
Labor	4,891	4,918		27	2,215	2,136	79	
Post Office	507,129	507,928		799	232,031	164,856	67,175	
State	20,825	20,997		172	7,264	6,820	444	
Treasury	80,418	79,181	1,237		33,316	31,369	1,947	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	267	263	4		145	137	8	
Bureau of the Budget	428	430		2	273	257	16	
Council of Economic Advisers	35	34	1		25	23	2	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	68			25	22	3	
National Security Council [4]	27	26	1		16	16		
Office of Defense Mobilization	292	295		3	152	153		1
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	6		1	3	4		1
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	20	12	8		3	5		2
American Battle Monuments Commission	790	820		30	118	102	16	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,012	5,966	46		2,933	2,932	1	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	582	586		4	269	259	10	
Civil Aeronautics Board	532	533		1	291	279	12	
Civil Service Commission	4,051	4,106		55	1,772	1,698	74	
Commission of Fine Arts [3]	3	3			1	1		
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	59	65		6	31	27	4	
Defense Transport Administration	17	18		1	11	11		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	135	135			77	73	4	
Farm Credit Administration	1,092	1,087	5		541	518	23	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	698	687	11		363	341	22	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	7	1		5	4	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,088	1,094		6	566	541	25	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,085	1,086		1	486	504		18
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	356	355	1		233	233		
Federal Power Commission	625	636		11	331	322	9	
Federal Trade Commission	591	594		3	328	312	16	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	175	182		7	105	102	3	
Foreign Operations Administration	6,257	6,129	128		2,734	2,601	133	
General Accounting Office	5,771	5,791		20	2,524	2,415	109	
General Services Administration	25,869	25,863	6		8,683	8,341	342	
Government Contract Committee	14	10	4		4	4		
Government Printing Office	6,749	6,781		32	2,883	2,813	70	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,393	10,427		34	4,773	4,624	149	
Indian Claims Commission	14	13	1		10	9	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,822	1,831		9	912	869	43	
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission [5]	2		2					

[1] January figure includes 499 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

[3] The Commission of Fine Arts, previously reported under the Interior Department, is now reported as an independent agency. December figures for Interior Department have been adjusted.

[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[5] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 263, 83d Cong.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1955, and comparison with December 1954, and pay for December 1954, and comparison with November 1954*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Independent Agencies—Continued								
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,188	7,160	28		3,308	3,115	193	
National Capital Housing Authority	285	287		2	92	97		5
National Capital Planning Commission	21	18	3		10	10		
National Gallery of Art	313	315		2	104	98	6	
National Labor Relations Board	1,150	1,172		22	623	605	18	
National Mediation Board	115	108	7		68	70		2
National Science Foundation	178	250		72	88	95		7
National Security Training Commission	7	7			5	3	2	
Panama Canal	15,638	15,758		120	3,480	2,717	763	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,445	2,390	55		927	853	74	
Renegotiation Board	596	606		10	369	355	14	
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	21	23		2	15	13	2	
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	18	22		4	11	3	8	
Securities and Exchange Commission	691	694		3	397	376	21	
Selective Service System	7,146	7,157		11	1,730	1,655	75	
Small Business Administration	757	756	1		413	394	19	
Smithsonian Institution	633	633			236	226	10	
Soldiers' Home	969	976		7	209	193	16	
Subversive Activities Control Board	35	35			23	20	3	
Tariff Commission	198	195	3		110	107	3	
Tax Court of the United States	141	142		1	76	74	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	21,824	22,712		888	10,594	10,746		152
United States Information Agency	9,671	9,551	120		2,457	2,335	122	
Veterans' Administration	177,806	177,735	71		59,915	56,413	3,502	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,170,191	1,188,166	3,612	21,587	485,997	403,005	83,180	188
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			17,975				82,992	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,920	1,914	6		1,055	1,016	39	
Department of the Army	465,470	464,590	880		153,512	126,965	26,547	
Department of the Navy	409,520	408,885	635		156,501	149,056	7,445	
Department of the Air Force	306,472	304,517	1,955		107,273	102,330	4,943	
Total Department of Defense	1,183,382	1,179,906	3,476		418,341	379,367	38,974	
Net increase, Department of Defense			3,476				38,974	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,353,573	2,368,072	7,088	21,587	904,338	782,372	122,154	188
Net change, including Department of Defense			14,499				121,966	

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during January 1955, and comparison with December 1954*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	69,761	69,144	617	
Commerce [1]	41,584	60,510		18,926
Health, Education, and Welfare	37,392	[2] 36,158	1,234	
Interior	43,926	[2] 44,216		290
Justice	29,791	29,735	56	
Labor	4,787	4,807		20
Post Office	504,785	505,584		799
State	5,835	5,789	46	
Treasury	79,429	78,192	1,237	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	267	263	4	
Bureau of the Budget	428	430		2
Council of Economic Advisers	35	34	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	68		
National Security Council [4]	27	26	1	
Office of Defense Mobilization	292	295		3
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	6		1
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	20	12	8	
American Battle Monuments Commission	18	17	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	5,996	5,951	45	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	582	586		4
Civil Aeronautics Board	528	529		1
Civil Service Commission	4,041	4,096		55
Commission of Fine Arts [3]	3	3		
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	59	65		6
Defense Transport Administration	17	18		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	135	135		
Farm Credit Administration	1,081	1,075	6	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	698	687	11	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	7	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,061	1,067		6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,084	1,085		1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	356	355	1	
Federal Power Commission	625	636		11
Federal Trade Commission	591	594		3
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	175	182		7
Foreign Operations Administration	1,651	1,627	24	
General Accounting Office	5,722	5,742		20
General Services Administration	25,760	25,751	9	
Government Contract Committee	14	10	4	
Government Printing Office	6,749	6,781		32
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,267	10,302		35
Independent agencies—Continued				
Indian Claims Commission	14	13	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,822	1,831		9
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission [5]	2		2	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,188	7,160	28	
National Capital Housing Authority	285	287		2
National Capital Planning Commission	21	18	3	
National Gallery of Art	313	315		2
National Labor Relations Board	1,128	1,151		23
National Mediation Board	115	108	7	
National Science Foundation	178	250		72
National Security Training Commission	7	7		
Panama Canal	543	551		8
Railroad Retirement Board	2,445	2,390	55	
Renegotiation Board	596	606		10
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	21	23		2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	18	22		4
Securities and Exchange Commission	691	694		3
Selective Service System	6,947	6,958		11
Small Business Administration	757	756	1	
Smithsonian Institution	631	631		
Soldiers' Home	969	976		7
Subversive Activities Control Board	35	35		
Tariff Commission	198	195	3	
Tax Court of the United States	141	142		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	21,824	22,712		888
United States Information Agency	2,210	2,190	20	
Veterans' Administration	176,531	176,476	55	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,111,283	1,129,067	3,481	21,265
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			17,784	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,866	1,859	7	
Department of the Army	373,359	373,050	309	
Department of the Navy	377,977	377,552	425	
Department of the Air Force	261,529	259,581	1,948	
Total, Department of Defense	1,014,731	1,012,042	2,689	
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,689	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,126,014	2,141,109	6,170	21,265
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			15,095	

[1] January figure includes 499 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] The Commission of Fine Arts, previously reported under the Interior Department, is now reported as an independent agency. December figures for Interior Department have been adjusted.
[4] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[5] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 263, 83d Cong.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1955, and comparison with December 1954*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,159	1,204		45
Commerce	2,882	2,876	6	
Health, Education, and Welfare	526	518	8	
Interior	5,617	5,626		9
Justice	512	514		2
Labor	104	111		7
Post Office	2,344	2,344		
State	14,990	15,208		218
Treasury	989	989		
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	772	803		31
Atomic Energy Commission	16	15	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	4		
Civil Service Commission	10	10		
Farm Credit Administration	11	12		1
Federal Communications Commission	27	27		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1		
Foreign Operations Administration	4,606	4,502	104	
General Accounting Office	49	49		
General Services Administration	109	112		3
Housing and Home Finance Agency	126	125	1	
National Labor Relations Board	22	21	1	
Panama Canal	15,095	15,207		112
Selective Service System	199	199		
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
United States Information Agency	7,461	7,361	100	
Veterans' Administration	1,275	1,259	16	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	58,908	59,099	237	428
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			191	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	54	55		1
Department of the Army	92,111	91,540	571	
Department of the Navy	31,543	31,333	210	
Department of the Air Force	44,943	44,936	7	
Total, Department of Defense	168,651	167,864	788	1
Net increase, Department of Defense			787	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	227,559	226,963	1,025	429
Net increase, including Department of Defense			596	

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during January 1955 and comparison with December 1954*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	2,778	2,819		41
Commerce	2,130	2,110	20	
Interior	7,755	7,846		91
Treasury	6,473	6,534		61
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	135	131	4	
Federal Communications Commission	14	14		
General Services Administration	900	868	32	
Government Printing Office	6,749	6,781		32
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,188	7,160	28	
Panama Canal	7,636	7,686		50
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,592	19,470		878
Total, excluding Department of Defense	60,350	61,419	84	1,153
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			1,069	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	[1] 207,900	[2] 207,786	114	
Outside continental United States	[1] 46,900	[2] 46,707	193	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	237,220	236,791	429	
Outside continental United States	6,894	6,922		28
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	154,418	153,394	1,024	
Outside continental United States	11,714	15,113		3,399
Total, Department of Defense	665,046	666,713	1,760	3,427
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,667	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	725,396	728,132	1,844	4,580
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			2,736	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I though IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of January 1955 and comparison with December 1954*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	January	December	January	December	January	December	January	December
Austria	171	171					171	171
England	7,290	7,117					7,290	7,117
France	20,884	20,274	14,503	14,001			6,381	6,273
Germany	124,804	124,019	101,871	101,551	1,972	1,971	20,961	20,497
Japan	157,228	157,581	95,781	[1] 95,781	18,543	18,499	42,904	43,304
Korea	28,431	28,343	28,431	28,343				
Lybia	1,050	1,077					1,050	1,077
Ryukyus	223	214			223	214		
Saudi Arabia	698	734					698	734
Spain	96	95					96	95
Trinidad	642	644			642	644		
Total	341,517	340,272	240,586	239,676	21,380	21,328	79,551	79,268

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French, English, Koreans, and Austrians reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of January totaling 2,353,573. This was a net decrease of 14,499 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of December.

The decrease resulted largely from the separation of temporary employees of the Census Bureau. Under these circumstances, the regular employment continued the downward trend it had followed for 27 of the past 30 months.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1955, which began July 1, 1954, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,387,833		5,187
August	2,375,988		11,845
September	2,355,170		20,818
October	2,359,325	4,155	
November	2,385,024	25,699	
December	2,368,072		16,952
January	2,353,573		14,499

Total employment in civilian agencies during the month of January was 1,170,191, a decrease of 17,975, compared with the December total of 1,188,166. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in January was 1,183,382. This was a net increase of 3,476, as compared with 1,179,906 in December.

Civilian agencies reporting the major decreases were: Department of Commerce, with a decrease of 18,920; Tennessee Valley Authority, with a decrease of 888; and the Post Office Department, with a decrease of 799. Major increases were reported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with an increase of 1,242; Department of the Treasury, with an increase of 1,237;

and the Department of Agriculture, with an increase of 572.

Increases in civilian employment by the Department of Defense were reported by Department of the Air Force, with an increase of 1,955; Department of the Army, with an increase of 880; Department of the Navy, with an increase of 635; and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, with an increase of 6.

Inside continental United States civilian employment decreased 15,095, and outside continental United States civilian employment increased 596.

Industrial employment by Federal agencies in January totaled 725,396, a decrease of 2,736 as compared with December.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies, as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,353,573 civilian employees certified to the committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports included some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but, in addition to these, there were 341,517 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies overseas during the month of January who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in December was 340,272. A breakdown of this employment for January follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Austria	171			171
England	7,290			7,290
France	20,884	14,503		6,381
Germany	124,804	101,871	1,972	20,961
Japan	157,228	95,781	18,543	42,904
Korea	28,431	28,431		
Lybia	1,050			1,050
Ryukyus	223		223	
Saudi Arabia	698			698
Spain	96			96
Trinidad	642		642	
Total	341,517	240,586	21,380	79,551

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1483. A bill for the relief of Mr. Irfan Kawar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 1484. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rosemary Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the amount of income tax payable in the case of an individual 65 years of age or over who sells his home and does not acquire a new one; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1486. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c);

S. 1487. A bill relating to contracts for the conduct of contract postal stations;

S. 1488. A bill relating to the payment of money orders;

S. 1489. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; and

S. 1490. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1491. A bill to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1492. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1493. A bill for the relief of Dorin Ursulesku Baron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1494. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the village of Central, in the State of New Mexico, certain lands administered by the Veterans' Administration facility at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1495. A bill to amend chapter 69 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the making of facsimile reproductions of certain naturalization and citizenship papers having historical value; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1496. A bill for the relief of Ruriko Hara; and

S. 1497. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1498. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1499. A bill to provide that school districts which filed applications for payments under Public Law 815, 81st Congress, before November 24, 1953, shall not be penalized on account of school-construction contracts made after that date; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 1500. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BENDER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. THYE, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. IVES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. POTTER):

S. 1501. A bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding a new title thereto providing additional authority for insurance of loans made for the construction of urgently needed housing for military personnel of the armed services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 1502. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, to require public hearings prior to withdrawals of all public lands, to limit temporary withdrawals to 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1503. A bill for the relief of Harold George Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 1504. A bill for the relief of Yee Loy Foo, also known as Loy Foo Yee, or Ted Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 1505. A bill to increase the salaries of teachers of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1506. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special stamp commemorative of the 50th anniversary of the United States Forest Service and accomplishments in conservation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL AND CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills providing pay increases for postal and classified Federal employees.

The bill providing pay increases for postal employees provides for an average of 7½-percent pay increase. The bill carries an overall 6-percent increase with a 1½-percent increase based on reclassification. The bill for classified employees carries a 6 percent across-the-board pay increase.

When the proposed legislation for a pay increase for both of these groups is before the Senate, I expect to offer them as substitutes for the bills submitted by the majority of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

S. 1489. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes.

S. 1490. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government.

GOLD REDEMPTION ACT OF 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, entitled "The Gold Redemption Act of 1955." It merely reestablishes for our citizens a privilege we already grant to foreigners. The United States Treasury accords to foreign central banks the privilege of obtaining gold in exchange for dollars at the rate of 1 troy ounce of gold for $35. My bill extends to Americans no more than the same rights accorded foreign interests. It removes an unfair discrimination against United

States citizens in favor of foreign central bankers.

During 1953, and down to June 1954, $1,247,000,000 in gold, at $35 an ounce, was transferred to foreign interests from our Treasury in exchange for dollars. There is no justice or economic sense in denying to United States citizens what we freely grant to foreign interests. Since January 31, 1934, we have made good in gold for dollars at that rate to foreign central banks with whose countries we were at peace. Is the Government of these United States at war with its own citizens? Then, why not treat them as well, at least, as we do foreign interests who may wish to exchange dollars for gold? Especially is that a minimum of justice to American citizens whose efforts cause the gold to come into the Treasury in exchange for the products of their toil and risk taking.

Twenty-two years ago we suspended specie payments in gold for American citizens. The then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Woodin, was reported in the New York Times and in other newspapers as saying that the suspension was for the time being and to meet an emergency. It followed the advice of J. M. Keynes—Lord Keynes of England. Whether there was an emergency in 1933 is doubtful, because there was more gold in the Treasury on January 1, 1933, than there was in the Treasury in September 1929. But those were days when many doubtful and in fact unconstitutional remedies were the fashion. That experiment of tinkering with the standard was abandoned January 31, 1934, with the dollar fixed at 35 to the ounce. It was followed by the NRA, which was declared unconstitutional and also abandoned. The President's right to further devalue the dollar expired in 1943, and, after review by the Senate, was not extended, but we had not put things in the rightful posture in regard to the first experiment which had been abandoned. We left the American citizen denuded of a right to redeem his dollar currency as well as any foreign interest. My bill clears up that uncertainty.

This bill is the same as that on which hearings were held by the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate in the last session, from March 29 through April 1. Consideration was given to the fact that $11 billion was held by foreign governments or central banks, or national banks, and private owners as well. However, when already swimming one does not fear that a shower may make one wet. We redeem the dollars of foreign interests in gold now, and my bill proposes no change in that. Foreign holders of obligations in dollars would be no more inclined nor no more able to draw an undue amount of gold after the enactment of my bill than before. In fact, it seems more likely that foreigners would be pleased to continue their investments in dollars in a country which unfailingly redeemed its currency to all holders of it, whether foreigners or citizens.

Irresponsible talk about devaluing the dollar is dangerous to stability. It would precipitate the very drain which critics of my bill say they fear. That is because any foreign central bank having any suspicion that the dollar would bring a lesser weight of gold than one thirty-fifth of an ounce, at some future date would be inclined to withdraw gold and remove it from our country. The enactment of my bill with the actual coinage of gold and offer of it for circulation among our own people is earnest of our intention to maintain the fixed standard of value hereafter.

Easy money does not make good times; in fact, quite the contrary. In 1939 we had 11 million unemployed, although we had been taken off the gold standard for our own people since 1933. We enacted the bill resuming specie payments after the experience of the depression of 1873. It ushered in the period beginning in 1879 known on economists' charts as the era of gold standard prosperity.

Nor does easy money assist in financing the public debt among buyers of long-term bonds. The certainty of payment in a fixed standard would, on the contrary, improve the saleability of bonds, and assist the Treasury in placing them with real savers, instead of being compelled to issue short-term notes bought chiefly by banks to work the engine of inflation.

The gold standard is no panacea. Its proponents do not claim that it will make prices higher, or lower; they do not say that it will save us from follies, of unwise speculation of itself; nor will it automatically balance the budget, although it will give us a measure of value which will permit us to see why we must do so in the long run.

The bill carries out the pledge to the American people in the Republican platform. It carries out the principles of many of the more responsible members of the Democratic Party. It is in the American tradition. All dollars are equal under my bill, because all are convertible on demand into our standard of value, gold at $35 to the ounce. The dollar of the American citizen will be as good as a dollar held by foreign interests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1491) to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TRANSFER OF CASES BETWEEN DISTRICT COURTS AND COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims.

At the present time, contract suits against the United States involving maritime matters may be brought either in the Court of Claims under the Tucker Act, or in the United States district courts in admiralty under the Suits in Admiralty Act or Public Vessels Act, depending upon whether the vessel was operated by or for the Government, as a public vessel, etc. A number of court decisions have been rendered over the past several years which are not entirely in harmony, and maritime litigants have frequently, because of complex factors and determinations involved, commenced suit in a court which is ultimately determined to be without jurisdiction. Thus, litigants having meritorious claims have commenced litigation in the wrong forum, and then, after the statute of limitations has run, have been barred from suit in the proper forum. Section 1500 of title 28 prohibits bringing suits concurrently in the Court of Claims and district courts.

The proposed legislation provides that if a case is brought in the district court in admiralty, and it later develops that it should have originally been brought in the Court of Claims under the Tucker Act, the case may then be transferred to the Court of Claims. The statute of limitations would be determined by the date of filing in the original court. Similarly, if a case were filed erroneously in the Court of Claims, then the case might ultimately be transferred to the district court in admiralty, the filing date in the Court of Claims being the determining date for purposes of determining the statute of limitations. Thus, a meritorious cause of action would not be barred if counsel should make an erroneous determination as to whether the vessel involved in the litigation was employed as a merchant vessel, or was a public vessel, or whether a contract with the United States was maritime or nonmaritime.

The proposed legislation is endorsed by the Maritime Law Association of the United States, and a companion bill (H. R. 668) is pending in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1497) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED ARMED SERVICES HOUSING INSURANCE ACT OF 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from

New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding a new title thereto providing additional authority for insurance of loans made for the construction of urgently needed housing for military personnel of the armed services.

The so-called Wherry Act, the Military Housing Act, will expire on June 30. Therefore, it will be necessary for Congress to enact new legislation if any housing is to be provided for our military personnel. The bill which I am introducing is, I believe, superior to the Wherry Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement and a memorandum, prepared by me, explaining the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1501) to amend the National Housing Act by adding a new title thereto providing additional authority for insurance of loans made for the construction of urgently needed housing for military personnel of the armed services, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Armed Services Housing Insurance Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. The National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title as follows:

"TITLE X—ARMED SERVICES HOUSING INSURANCE

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 1001. The purpose of this title is to assist in relieving the acute shortage of housing accommodations that now exists on military installations and to increase the supply of necessary housing accommodations for military personnel at such installations. To effectuate this purpose, the Commissioner shall, upon application of the mortgagee, insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided, and, make commitments for so insuring such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount of contingent liability outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed $1,350,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 1002. To be eligible for insurance under this title, a mortgage shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The mortgaged property shall be designed for use for residential purposes by military personnel of the armed services and situated at or near a military installation. No mortgage shall be insured under this title unless the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or their designees, shall have certified to the Commissioner that the housing with respect to which the mortgage is made is necessary to provide public quarters at such military installation and that there is no present intention to curtail substantially the activities at such installation. The certification shall be accepted by the Federal Housing Commissioner as conclusive evidence of the necessity of providing public quarters for such military installation.

"(2) The mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount:

"(A) Not to exceed the amount which an eligible builder (as defined in section 3 of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Act of 1955) has bid to construct the housing project; and

"(B) Not to exceed an average of $13,500 per family unit for such part of the property as may be attributable to dwelling use.

"AMORTIZATION AND INTEREST

"SEC. 1003. The mortgage shall provide for complete amortization by periodic payments over a period of not to exceed 25 years and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum of the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time. The Commissioner may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"PREMIUM

"SEC. 1004. For insurance granted pursuant to this title, the Commissioner shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge is payable, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the mortgagee, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Commissioner under this title at par plus accrued interest. Upon presentation of a mortgage for insurance that complies with the provisions of this title and tender of the initial premium charge, such mortgage shall be accepted for insurance by endorsement or otherwise as the Commissioner may prescribe. In insuring mortgages under this section, the Commissioner is authorized to waive his usual requirement for property and hazard insurance. In the event the principal obligation of any mortgage accepted for insurance under this title is paid in full prior to the maturity date, the Commissioner is authorized to refund to the mortgagee for the account of the mortgagor all, or such portion as he shall determine to be equitable, of the current unearned premium charge theretofore paid.

"DEFAULT

"SEC. 1005. (a) The failure of the mortgagor to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of a mortgage insured under this title shall be considered a default under such mortgage and, if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance as hereinafter provided, upon assignment, transfer, and delivery to the Commissioner, within a period and in accordance with rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of:

"(1) All rights and interest arising under the mortgage in default;

"(2) All claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagors or others, arising out of the mortgage transaction;

"(3) All policies of title or other insurance or surety bonds or other guarantees and any and all claims thereunder;

"(4) Any balance of the mortgage loan not advanced to the mortgagor;

"(5) Any cash or property held by the mortgagee, or to which it is entitled, as deposits made for the account of the mortgagor and which have not been applied in reduction of the principal of the mortgage indebtedness; and

"(6) All records, documents, books, papers, and accounts relating to the mortgage transaction.

"(b) Upon such assignment, transfer, and delivery, the obligation of the mortgagee to pay the premium charge for mortgage insurance shall cease, and the Commissioner shall, subject to the cash adjustment provided for in section 1006 of this title, issue to the mortgagee debentures having a total face value equal to the value of the mortgage, and a certificate of claim as hereinafter provided.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the value of the mortgage shall be determined in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, by adding to the amount of the original principal obligation of the mortgage which was unpaid on the date of default, the amount the mortgagee may have paid for:

"(1) Any liens that are prior to the mortgage, including special assessments, water rates or taxes when applicable.

"(2) Insurance on the property; and

"(3) Reasonable expenses for the completion and preservation of the property and any mortgage insurance premiums paid after default; less the sum of:

"(A) Any amount received on account of the mortgage after such date; and

"(B) Any net income received by the mortgagee from the property after such date: *Provided*, That the mortgagee in the event of a default under the mortgage may, at its option and in accordance with regulations of, and in a period to be determined by, the Commissioner, proceed to foreclose on and obtain possession of or otherwise acquire such property from the mortgagor after default, and receive the benefits of the insurance as hereinafter provided, upon.

"(1) the prompt conveyance to the Commissioner of the mortgagee's interest in the property which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Commissioner in force at the time the mortgage was insured, and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations; and

"(2) the assignment to him of all claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagor or others, arising out of the mortgage transaction or foreclosure proceedings, except such claims that may have been released with the consent of the Commissioner. Upon such conveyance and assignment, the obligation of the mortgagee to pay the premium charge for insurance shall cease and the mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance as provided in this section.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 1006 (a). Debentures issued under this title shall be in such form and denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and shall include such provisions for redemption, if any, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be in coupon or registered form. Any difference between the value of the mortgage determined as herein provided and the aggregate face value of the debentures issued, not to exceed $50, shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Commissioner to the mortgagee from the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund.

"(b) Debentures issued under this title shall be executed in the name of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Commissioner, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. All such debentures shall be dated as of the date of default as determined in accordance with section 1005

of this title, and shall bear interest from such date at a rate determined by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the mortgage was accepted for insurance, but not to exceed 3 percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature 10 years after the date thereof.

"(c) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed, by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. They shall be paid out of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund which shall be primarily liable therefor, and they shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face of the debentures. In the event the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, and thereupon to the extent of the amount so paid the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holder of such debentures.

"CERTIFICATE OF CLAIM

"SEC. 1007. The certificate of claim issued by the Commissioner to any mortgagee in connection with the insurance of mortgages under this title shall be for an amount determined in accordance with subsections (e) and (f) of section 604 of this act, except that any amount remaining after the payment of the full amount under the certificate of claim shall be retained by the Commissioner and credited to the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 1008 (a). There is hereby created the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Commissioner as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for payment of his administrative expenses in connection therewith. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Commissioner such funds as the Commissioner shall deem necessary, but not to exceed $10 million, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. For immediate needs pending such appropriation, the Commissioner is directed to transfer the sum of $1 million to such fund from the War Housing Insurance Fund created by section 602 of this act, as amended, such amount to be reimbursed to the War Housing Insurance Fund upon the availability of the appropriations authorized by this section. General expenses of operation of the Federal Housing Administration under this title may be charged to the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund.

"(b) Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, and appraisal and other fees, received on account of the insurance of any mortgage insured under this title, the receipts derived from any such mortgage or claim assigned to the Commissioner and any property acquired by the Commissioner under this title, and all earnings on the assets of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund, shall be credited to such fund. The principal of and interest paid and to be paid on debentures issued in exchange for any mortgage or property insured under this title, cash adjustments, and expenses incurred in the handling of such mortgages or property and in the foreclosure and collection of mortgages and claims assigned to the Commissioner under this title, shall be charged to the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund.

"(c) Moneys in the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of such fund, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"CONTRACT OF INSURANCE CONCLUSIVE

"SEC. 1009. Any contract of insurance executed by the Commissioner under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the mortgage for insurance, and the validity of any contract of insurance so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an approved mortgagee from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such approved mortgagee.

"SECONDARY MARKET

"SEC. 1010. In order to assure an adequate market for mortgages insured under this title, the powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency hereinafter established, to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with mortgages insured under this title.

"POWER TO INSURE UNDER OTHER TITLES

"SEC. 1011. The Commissioner shall also have power to insure under this title or titles II or VI any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by him of any property acquired under this title without regard to any limit as to eligibility, time or aggregate amount contained in this title or titles II or VI.

"APPLICABILITY OF OTHER SECTIONS OF ACT

"SEC. 1012. The provisions of section 207 (k) and section 207 (l) of this act shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this title and to property acquired by the Commissioner hereunder, except that as applied to such mortgages and property:

"(1) All references in such sections to the 'Housing Fund' shall be construed to refer to the 'Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund,' and

"(2) The reference in section 207 (k) to 'subsection (g)' shall be construed to refer to 'section 1003' of this title.

"INAPPLICABILITY OF PROVISION IN SECTION 214

"SEC. 1013. The second sentence of section 214 of this act, as amended, relating to housing in the Territory of Alaska, shall not apply to mortgages insured under this title on property in said Territory.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 1014. The Commissioner may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISION

"SEC. 1015. Section 1 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out 'Titles II, III, VI, VII, VIII, and IX' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'Titles II, III, VI, VII, VIII, IX and X'.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 1016. The following terms shall have the meanings respectively ascribed to them below:

"(a) 'Mortgage' means a first mortgage on real estate held in fee simple or under a lease.

"(b) 'First mortgage' means such classes of first liens as are commonly given to secure advances on or the unpaid purchase price of real estate under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located together with the credit instruments, if any, secured thereby.

"(c) 'Mortgagee' includes the original lender under a mortgage and his successors and assigns approved by the Commissioner.

"(d) 'Mortgagor' includes the original borrower under a mortgage, its successors and assigns (including the United States acting through the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force or their respective designees, and its assigns).

"(e) 'Maturity date' means the date on which the mortgage indebtedness would be extinguished if paid in accordance with periodic payments provided for in the mortgage.

"(f) 'Housing accommodations' means housing designed for use by Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps personnel, and their dependents, assigned to duty at the military installation at or in the area where such property is constructed.

"(g) 'Military' includes Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

"(h) 'State' includes the several States and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and Guam."

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are hereby authorized to enter into contracts with any eligible builder to provide for the construction of urgently needed housing on lands owned or leased by the United States and situated on or near a military reservation or installation for the purpose of providing suitable living accommodations for military personnel of the armed services assigned to duty at the military installation at or in the area where the housing is situated. Any such contract shall contain such terms and conditions, including the amount of the mortgage that the Commissioner shall insure, as the Secretary may determine to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States. The terms and conditions of such contract shall be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner that the contractor is an eligible builder within the meaning of this act and that the amount set forth in the contract as to the cost of the housing is the amount that shall be insured.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized to acquire by lease or otherwise, the housing constructed pursuant to such contracts; to maintain and operate such housing; to assume the payment of notes, mortgages, or other legal instruments required by the Federal Housing Commissioner of the owners or mortgagors or prospective owners or mortgagors constructing housing projects insured under title X of the National Housing Act, and to make amortization payments thereon; but, all rental or other payments made during any year in the case of any housing so acquired shall not exceed an average living unit payment of $90 per month, and, in the case of any one of the military departments total payments per month for all housing so acquired, shall not exceed $9 million per month.

(c) For the purposes of this act, the term "eligible builder" means a person, partnership, firm or corporation determined by the Secretary (1) to be qualified by experience and financial responsibility to construct housing of the type described in subsection (a) of this section, and (2) to have submitted the lowest acceptable bid as provided in subsection (d) of this section.

(d) Before the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force shall enter into any contract with any builder as provided in this section for the construction of any housing he shall invite the submission of competitive bids after advertising in the manner pre-

scribed in section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

SEC. 4. Whenever the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force shall deem it necessary for the purposes of this act, he may acquire by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer, or may cause proceedings to be instituted in any court having jurisdiction of such proceedings to acquire by condemnation, any unimproved land adjacent to a military reservation or installation. Any such condemnation proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357), as amended, or any other applicable Federal statute. Before condemnation proceedings are instituted pursuant to this section, an effort shall be made to acquire the property involved by negotiation unless, because of reasonable doubt as to the identity of the owner or owners, because of the large number of persons with whom it would be necessary to negotiate, or for other reasons, the effort to acquire by negotiation would involve, in the judgment of the Secretary, such delay in acquiring the property as to be contrary to the interest of national defense. In any condemnation proceeding instituted pursuant to this section, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 percent of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding. Property acquired under this section may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this section prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

SEC. 5. Whenever the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force determines that it is necessary to lease any land held by the United States on or near a military reservation or installation to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may lease such land upon such terms and conditions as will, in his opinion, best serve the national interest.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force or their designees are authorized to assign quarters in any housing acquired under this act to military personnel in the same manner and to the same extent as other public quarters are so assigned.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized, upon a determination that such action is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, to procure by negotiation or otherwise the services of experts and consultants (including architects and engineers), or organizations thereof under such arrangements as they may deem desirable without regard to the civil service and classification laws, to compensate any individuals so procured at rates not in excess of $50 per day, and to pay travel expenses of such individuals, including actual transportation costs and per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence while traveling to and from their respective homes or places of business and the official duty station as may be authorized in travel orders or letters of appointment. Such services may include the development of plans, drawings, and specifications for housing and related facilities under the authority of this act and for other services in connection therewith, including inspection of construction.

(b) The procurement of services in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section may include provisions for advances or progress payments, for payment by third parties, for payment by the Government of any such compensation as is not paid for by third parties. Provision may be made for reimbursement by third parties or from mortgage funds to the Government pursuant to this section, and other provisions may be made for compensation. All reimbursement paid to the Government on account of payments made pursuant to this section, or other sections of this act, shall be credited to the appropriations or funds against which such payments were charged. Any public-works appropriations now or hereafter available to the Department of the Army, Navy, or Air Force may be obligated by the respective Department for these purposes.

SEC. 8. (a) There are hereby athorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 3 through 7 of this act.

(b) Any funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be expended by any of the military departments for the payment of allowances for quarters for military personnel may be used for the purposes specified in subsection (a) above.

The statement and memorandum, presented by Mr. CAPEHART, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

By a record vote of 399 to 1, the House approved last Thursday, March 10, 1955, an incentive-pay increase for nearly 2 million career men and women in the armed services ranging from 6 percent to 25 percent. This pay increase certainly is deserved and appropriate.

Another great military necessity exists. There is an alarmingly acute shortage of housing accommodations for military personnel and their families. This possibly constitutes the greatest need today of all branches of the armed services.

At present about 80 percent of the officers and about 20 percent of the enlisted personnel are married and are in the three top pay grades. Under existing permanent legislation, these personnel are entitled to Government quarters or rental allowances in lieu thereof. The requirement for housing on the basis of this permanent legislation is 140,000 units for officers and 315,000 units for enlisted men, making a total of 455,000 units for a permanent peacetime strength of 1,750,000 men. At present there are nearly 3 million men in the various services.

To meet the housing requirement presently for these people, the services have only 124,000 permanent units of family housing, plus 100,000 units of temporary housing (25,000 only of which are in good condition), and an estimated community support of 150,000 units. This leaves an estimated deficiency of at least 150,000 housing units needed now, and badly, by the permanent Military Establishment.

The lower four grades are likewise entitled to Government quarters or rental allowances in lieu thereof by temporary legislation expiring on June 30 of this year. It is believed, however, that the Congress may be asked to make this legislation permanent. Twenty percent of this personnel likewise are married. To provide housing for them would require approximately 300,000 additional units. However, since the legislation is not permanent, these personnel have not been included in the above calculations.

Experience convinces us that a happy wife and a happy family mean a more happy, a more satisfied, a more efficient serviceman.

I am convinced that a solution to the present inadequate housing for service personnel is both in the best interest of our national defense and of our taxpayers. Too seldom in this day and age of the A-bomb and the H-bomb and the highly complicated and intricate mechanized equipment do we consider either the time or the money required to train men and women in the arts of present day technical warfare.

It is estimated today that to train 1 pilot for our modern airplanes costs $40,000 or more. To train 1 enlisted technician to service our airplanes and their equipment costs about $14,000 and requires a period of 28 months out of the 4-year enlistment period.

Now let us consider reenlistments by Regulars in all branches of the service. For the period July 1 to December 31, 1954, 76 percent of the Regulars in all branches did not reenlist—a truly appalling fact considering the waste both in manpower and in money.

It has been estimated that in order to maintain a reasonably well-trained Military Establishment, at least 33 percent of the Regulars should reenlist instead of the present 24 percent. For every 1 percent that reenlistments are raised, the Air Force alone estimates that $20,400,000 is saved. Moreover, and of much greater significance, is the fact that for every percent the reenlistment of Regulars is raised, a combat team with more efficient operations is saved and maintained.

I firmly believe that if we provide the housing we should provide, we will find that reenlistments meet the expectation and the need. It is for this reason that I am today, joined by many Members of this body, introducing a bill which I believe will go far toward solving the housing problem for the armed services.

Many Senators, upon hearing of my proposal, have asked to join as cosponsors. In view of the very widespread interest in this bill on both sides of the aisle, I am asking that it lay on the table for 3 days so that others of my colleagues who wish to do so may have an opportunity to join as cosponsors.

MEMORANDUM IN EXPLANATION OF S. 1501

A draft of a bill to provide urgently needed housing for military personnel of the armed services and their families is attached.

I took the "best of Wherry," eliminating those provisions which are said to have constituted roadblocks to obtaining this needed housing, and added needed new features.

The FHA mortgage insurance feature is utilized with the establishment of a separate fund to be known as the "Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund."

Under Wherry, it is necessary to have a sponsor, a builder, and someone to maintain and operate the project upon completion of construction. All three of these functions frequently were performed by the same person but not necessarily so.

The attached bill dispenses with the need for an outside sponsor and for outside maintenance and operation after construction.

A sponsor, as such, is not needed. Insofar as the functions formerly performed by a sponsor are concerned, these are performed by the branch of the service interested and the builder.

Maintenance after construction is by the interested service. By eliminating maintenance and operation cost, we have estimated that a billion dollars could have been saved with respect to the 80,000 Wherry units now built or in process.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF BILL

New title X—"Armed Services Housing Insurance," an amendment to the National Housing Act.

Insurance mandatory

When the appropriate Secretary certifies to the Commissioner of FHA that (1) the housing with respect to which the mortgage is made is necessary; and (2) no present intention exists to curtail substantially the

activities of such installation, the Commissioner of FHA must grant insurance on the mortgage in an amount not to exceed—

(a) The amount of the lowest acceptable responsible bid as established by competitive-bid procedure in accordance with section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

(b) An average of $13,500 per family unit.

Comment: This provision eliminates the discretion of FHA, presently existing administratively under the Wherry Act, to approve or disapprove the granting of mortgage insurance, depending upon whether FHA thought the proposal was economically sound or the units were needed at the installation in question.

The responsible military authority should know better than anyone else what is required. A careful check by the "watchdog committee" of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee could and should be kept to the end that the military does not abuse this newly granted authority.

In reducing the responsibility of FHA, it is anticipated that processing time will be cut in half. The average processing time under the Wherry Act before a spade of dirt is turned is about 13 months. Construction is not completed for at least another year.

Although the matter has not been explored with FHA, I rather suspect that the Commissioner might not be too unhappy to be relieved of the above-discussed responsibility.

It is intended and I believe that since the builder is purely and simply a builder neither mortgaging out nor the reaping of windfall profits are possible.

The lowest financially responsible bidder will be awarded each contract. Naturally, included in the bid is what he hopes will be his profit. This, however, is not repulsive but is in the best American tradition. Exercise of diligence by the military services will make excessive profits unlikely at least, if not impossible.

The cost must not exceed an average of $13,500 per family unit. This amount is neither the maximum nor the minimum. The reason for this flexibility is obvious. A serviceman with a monthly quarters allowance of $90 should not receive the same type quarters as one with a monthly quarters allowance of $170.

Presently, under the Wherry Act, the average living space is about 865 square feet. Under this bill, using the amount suggested, it is thought that a minimum of 1,080 and a maximum of nearly 1,400 square feet of living space can be obtained, with a few units for flag or general officers that may approach 2,100 square feet.

Amortization and interest

The mortgage must provide for complete amortization over a period of not to exceed 25 years at a rate of interest of not to exceed 4 percent.

Comment: It is estimated variously that amortization is readily possible in from 18 to 25 years, utilizing the quarters' allowances granted the military occupant.

It is believed that private capital will be interested at a rate of interest of about 3¼ percent, which is the same percentage now paid to finance the college dormitory construction under the Housing Act.

Insurance premium

A premium charge of not to exceed one-half of 1 percent, to be fixed by the Commissioner, must be paid by the mortgagee for the insurance granted.

Comment: Under Wherry, discretion is in the Commissioner to fix the premium charge at anywhere between one-half of 1 percent and 1½ percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year.

I believe that a maximum premium of one-half of 1 percent is adequate under this bill. By making the premium relatively low, I hope that the mortgages will thereby become more atractive to private capital.

Default

In the event of a default that continues for 30 days, the mortgagee may receive the benefits of the insurance provided under the bill by proceeding in 1 of 2 ways:

1. Assign, transfer, and deliver to the Commissioner all of his right, title, and interest in the mortgage. Thereupon, premium charges for insurance shall cease and the Commissioner shall proceed to issue debentures to the mortgagee having a face value equal to the value of the mortgage, subject to cash adjustments.

2. Foreclose and obtain possession of the property, conveying the mortgagee's interest to the Commissioner and assigning all claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagor to the Commissioner. Thereupon, the mortgagee is entitled to receive mortgage debentures in the face amount of the insurance, subject to cash adjustments.

Comment: These provisions follow substantially the already well-established pattern in the law with respect to FHA mortgage insurance.

Debentures

Debentures may be issued in the name of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund as obligor in such form and denominations in multiples of $50, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such debentures shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum, as determined by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, bearing date as of the date of default. They mature 10 years from date.

These debentures are exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation, except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes. Payment of the debentures, in the first instance, is out of the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund which is primarily liable. In the event such fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the Secretary of the Treasury must honor the debentures. This means that the debentures are fully and unconditionally guaranteed by the United States.

Comment: In order to interest private capital, it appears essential that either the full faith and credit of the United States or a guaranty of the United States be behind all debentures issued by the Commissioner in payment to the mortgagee in the event of default.

I have been informed that this matter has been explored fully and thoroughly with the big insurance companies and others on several occasions and that they insist on one or the other requirement.

The guaranty method has been utilized for several reasons, principally because its operation is well known and understood.

It is my understanding that until there is a default and an issue of debentures to pay the mortgagee, any obligation resulting from the issuance of insurance on mortgages under the bill is no more than a contingent liability of the United States, and consequently, could not affect the national debt limit.

In case of default and the issuance of debentures, it is my understanding that for the first time a direct obligation exists against the United States which could affect the debt limit.

It is anticipated that the insurance fund will be adequate to pay in the event of any default. Actually, there would seem to be little likelihood of any mortgage going into default. Virtually the only possibility would appear to be when the installation is abandoned by the interested military service.

The military would assign its personnel to quarters in these units just as it otherwise assigns public quarters. This means that the quarters' allowances, whether they be $90—the average monthly quarters' allowance—or $170—the monthly quarters' allowance for general officers—will be withheld from the assigned personnel and used to make periodic payments on the principal and interest of the mortgages outstanding against the respective housing accommodations.

Insurance fund

The bill creates the Armed Services Housing Insurance Fund, which is similar to the Military Housing Insurance Fund under Wherry.

Authorization is given the Secretary of the Treasury to make available immediately for the use of the fund the sum of $10 million. Immediate transfer of $1 million from the War Housing Insurance Fund is directed in order that general expenses and operations may be paid prior to the transfer of the $10 million.

Premium charges are earmarked for the fund.

Comment: The procedure here utilized is similar to that which was used to establish the insurance fund under Wherry.

Secondary mortgage market

In order to assure an adequate market, FNMA is specifically authorized to purchase, service, and sell.

The following is with reference to sections 3 through 8 of the bill. These sections are not amendments to the Housing Act, but deal rather with providing adequate authority in the Secretaries of the armed services to utilize the provisions under new title X of the Housing Act.

Authorities in the Secretaries

The Secretaries are authorized to acquire by purchase, by lease, or by condemnation—similar to provision as set forth in Defense Production Act of 1950—real estate needed to effectuate the purposes of the bill.

The appropriate Secretary is also authorized to enter into contracts with any eligible bidder for the construction of housing for occupancy by military personnel of the armed services. Specifically, the competitive bid procedure as provided for in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, must be followed, with plans and specifications to be developed by the military departments.

An "eligible bidder" is defined as a person, partnership, firm, or corporation qualified by experience and financial responsibility to construct the housing required and who has submitted the lowest acceptable bid.

Authority is given the appropriate Secretary to lease any land held by the United States to an eligible bidder and also to assign quarters to military personnel, withholding therefrom the quarters' allowances of the presonnel so assigned.

The aggregate amount of contingent liability outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure cannot exceed $1,350,000,000. This ceiling makes a potential of 100,000 units available before further fund authorization need be sought of the Congress. This is calculated on the basis of an average per unit payment of $90 per month with a total payment per month by any one branch of the military not to exceed $9 million.

Comment: It appears appropriate and necessary to grant the Secretaries of the various services rather flexible authority in order to permit them to effectively implement the act. Such has been done. Administrative rules and regulations under the act will be promulgated by the military services and FHA.

In the past it has been found to be both unwise and virtually impossible to write rules and regulations into statutes. These properly should be handled administratively by the issuance of appropriate rules and regulations.

In some situations it may be necessary for the military service involved to acquire additional land for the reason that sufficient

space is not presently available on the reservation or base. Authority to do so is provided. Cost of such acquisition can be included in the average unit cost of $13,500.

An accelerated condemnation procedure is included in the bill. This is similar to the provision found in the Defense Production Act of 1950. It was utilized because it appears that time is of the essence.

Competitive bidding is one of the key features of the bill. It will be governed by section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. An "eligible bidder" is defined in a manner that follows the recognized definition used in such Procurement Act.

Specific authority is given the appropriate Secretary to lease to the successful bidder the real estate on which the units are to be constructed. This is done in order to provide a further tool, which may be needed to obtain private financing of the housing.

It is expected that the military and/or FHA will issue rules and regulations covering the terms and conditions to be included in the contract entered into between the military service involved and the successful bidder.

I would expect also that the successful bidder will be required by regulation to form a construction corporation, with the common stock to be issued to the bidder and the preferred stock to be held by FHA.

The construction contract would be entered into between the military and the builder corporation. Very likely, in order to aid in obtaining private financing the military would lease to the construction corporation the real estate on which the units are to be constructed.

Armed with the construction contract and with a lease in excess of 25 years (probably 50 years to meet FNMA requirements), the construction corporation would go to FHA for an insurance commitment, without additional processing. Upon receipt of an insurance commitment from FHA, the construction corporation would seem to have adequate collateral to obtain funds in the amount of the bid price, payable probably as the work proceeds, from private lending institutions.

The construction corporation would continue in existence until the mortgage is retired. The common stock of the corporation, however, would be transferred and delivered to the respective Secretary where it could be held until full payment of the mortgage is made. Thereafter, the corporation would be dissolved by the military department, thus merging the lease in the fee.

To simplify bookkeeping the military probably would want and could get the construction corporation to assign to the mortgagee all of its right, title, and interest in and to the quarters' allowance payments allocated to the mortgaged premises. If so, payments on the mortgage could then be made direct to the mortgagee.

CONCLUSION

The sole purpose of this legislation is to make available the tools whereby necessary housing can be had by the military. I believe this bill provides the answer to this urgent military necessity.

There are, of course, other approaches. I have considered all of these but decided finally in favor of the approach suggested in this bill. My reason for reaching this decision is twofold. First of all, I cannot visualize any appreciable advantage to be gained by utilizing any of the other approaches. Moreover, I can think of some disadvantages that appear inherent in other approaches to the problem that are not present in the suggested approach.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask also that the bill be not referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency until next Tuesday, because it is an amendment to the housing act, and I wish to give every Senator an opportunity to become a co-sponsor of the bill.

Our military personnel need housing urgently, and I am hopeful that it will be possible to go before the Committee on Banking and Currency with a bill sponsored by practically every Member of the Senate, if not every Member. In that way, it will be possible for the committee to act on the bill promptly and to have it passed by the Senate immediately thereafter. Our military personnel do not have proper housing, which they should have; therefore, Congress should act immediately on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed and lie on the table until next Tuesday, at which time it may be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, containing the names of additional Senators who may wish to join as co-sponsors.

I did not have time to invite all Senators to become co-sponsors, because it would be a big job to speak with 95 Senators. It is for that reason that I am asking that the bill lie on the table until next Tuesday.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR TEACHERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the salaries of teachers of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, pertaining to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1505) to increase the salaries of teachers of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. MCNAMARA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The statement presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

For myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] I have today introduced a bill to increase the salaries of District of Columbia teachers by $600 per annum, effective July 1, 1955.

As a former member of the teaching profession, I am keenly aware of the inadequacy of teachers' salaries, not only in the District of Columbia but also throughout the Nation. After all, our teachers, together with parents, guide and inspire American children of today—America's leaders of tomorrow. Teachers, who are entrusted with this tremendous responsibility, deserve salaries commensurate with their high obligations.

Three other Members of the Senate have indicated their desire to increase the teachers' pay in sponsoring an omnibus bill, which bill also includes provisions relating to personnel reorganization, leave, classification, tenure, and new positions. All of these provisions are important and will require extended study. However, I am fearful lest the period necessary for such study may delay the enactment of the vitally essential teachers' pay increase.

It is my sincere hope that Congress acts favorably and speedily upon this bill so that teachers employed in our Nation's Capital for the coming school year will be assured of long overdue and greatly deserved salary increases.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP FOR 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Postmaster General to issue a special stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the United States Forest Service and accomplishments in the field of conservation.

Fifty years ago President Theodore Roosevelt signed the bill establishing the United States Forest Service. He immediately named Gifford Pinchot of Pennsylvania, one of America's great conservationists, as Chief Forester.

Even earlier President Benjamin Harrison signed a bill setting aside certain timbered areas as "forest preserves." His first official act was to set aside and create Yellowstone Park Timberland, now Yellowstone National Park. During the remainder of his administration he set aside 13 million acres. President Cleveland followed by adding an additional 20 million acres.

In more recent times the American people have come to a general realization of the wisdom and prudence of conservation, not only of our forested areas but the need to practice soil conservation, water conservation, fish and wildlife conservation, and the conserving of our mineral resources.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower has often expressed his belief that we must expand the program of water conservation in which protection against the denuding of forest areas is so important.

So, Mr. President, I urge favorable action on this bill to authorize the Postmaster General to issue a special stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the United States Forest Service and accomplishments in the field of conservation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an article by Aubrey Graves, known as the "Squire of Grigsby Hill," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 30, 1955, which tells the story of the growth of the United States Forest Service, be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1506) to authorize the issuance of a special stamp commemorative of the 50th anniversary of the United States Forest Service and accomplishments in conservation, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil

Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance, on as early a date as is practicable during the calendar year 1955, a special postage stamp of 3-cent denomination, of such appropriate design as he shall prescribe, in recognition of the outstanding accomplishments in the field of conservation, and in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the United States Forest Service.

The article presented by Mr. CASE is as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 30, 1955]

To early settlers the wide land that later became the United States must have appeared as one vast wooded area. Most of the country except the Great Plains was covered with timber.

In the beginning the forest was both blessing and hardship. It supplied the pioneer with fuel and building material. But at times it stood in his way.

Before he could farm or build a road, timber had to be cleared away. Sometimes it was felled carefully with an ax. Too often the unthinking found it easier to put huge stretches to flame.

Later the woodlands were logged, with little thought of the future. Lumberjacks chopped through the dwindling forests, leaving wastelands as their sawmills moved onward.

Not until 1891 was anything really done to crack down on fire and reckless chopping. That year Congress authorized the President to set aside "forest preserves."

President Benjamin Harrison created the first—Yellowstone Park Timberland. Before his term was over he had set aside 13 million acres. President Cleveland added more than 20 million.

In 1C98, Gifford Pinchot, a great conservationist, was appointed head of the Forestry Division. When President Theodore Roosevelt signed a bill creating the Forest Service in 1905, Pinchot became Chief Forester. From the Secretary of Agriculture came this directive: Manage the Forest Service reserves so that they would provide "the greatest good to the greatest number of people in the long run."

Our system of national forests now reaches from the West to the Lake States, from Puerto Rico to Alaska. It takes in East and South. It lies within or across the borders of 40 States. Today there are more than 150 national forests, covering 181 million acres.

The Service has grown from a handful of crusading conservationists to a vast land-management, research, and educational agency. It has more than 6,700 year-round employees, and twice that many during the forest-fire-danger season.

Millions of woodland acres, once stripped by cutting and by fires, have been replanted—by private owners and Government seeders. Today our woods are producing 5 billion board feet of lumber annually, all the Nation needs. Foresters tell us that production can be doubled when necessary.

Within their shady depths, our forests furnish seasonal grazing to millions of cattle and sheep. In them millions of Americans find recreation.

One-third of all our big game animals and countless thousands of fur bearers and waterfowl live therein. Beaver, deer, elk, moose, mountain goats, bighorn sheep and many kinds of birds attract hunters by the thousands.

More than 80,000 miles of trout streams and 1,550,000 acres of lakes offer sport to the angler.

The wilderness is rapidly vanishing from our continent but within the national forests about 75 areas (some 14 million acres in all) have been set aside to remain free of nearly all man-made changes.

These wilderness areas are accessible only by trail or water. "Practical" men preaching "progress" still try to encroach upon them, but up to now have been directed to go elsewhere to build their power dams.

The Forest Service has come a long way.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CLASSIFIED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. KUCHEL) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 67) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him at the Hotel Astor, New York, N. Y., March 17, 1955, before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

By Mr. ERVIN:

Jefferson-Jackson Day address delivered by Senator ANDERSON at Raleigh, N. C., on February 5, 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "Russia, China, and the Outlook in the Pacific," delivered by him before the Intelligence Chapter of the Reserve Officers Association, in Washington, D. C., on March 16, 1955.

Statement prepared by him and an address delivered by Hon. Morehead Patterson relating to the international atomic-energy program, which will appear hereafter in the RECORD.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for Mr. ALLOTT):

Statement prepared by Senator ALLOTT concerning National Correct Posture Week.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE BILL 256, RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF CUMULATIVE VOTING OF SHARES OF STOCK IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Banking of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held on S. 256, to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association, beginning at 10: 00 a. m. on Thursday, April 7, 1955, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone, National 8-3120, extension 865, as soon as possible.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. McFADDEN, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert C. McFadden, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana, vice Julius J. Wichser, resigned.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee on or before Friday, March 25, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF THOMAS H. TRENT, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of Thomas H. Trent, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida, vice Leo H. Brooker, resigned, to file with the committee in writing on or before Friday, March 25, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF CERTAIN CIRCUIT JUDGES

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 29, 1955, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Louie W. Strum, deceased.

Gerald R. Corbett, of Hawaii, to be sixth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representatives as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there are at the desk three resolutions coming from the House of Representatives, namely, House Concurrent Resolution 91, House Concurrent Resolution 93, and House Joint Resolution 250. They relate strictly to the business of the House of

Representatives. I ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object, because these measures come under the rule of comity and the custom of the two Houses in respect to purely housekeeping matters, to permit such measures coming from the other body to go through in the way it desires—for the record I merely wish to state that this should not be considered a precedent for Senate resolutions or for other measures which normally require joint action by the two bodies.

However, I have no objection in this case, inasmuch as these measures are House resolutions only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona? Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS—PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 91.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held by the said committee during the 83d Congress, 2d session, on the organization and administration of the military research and development programs.

HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE—REPRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT 210

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 93.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 93) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is ordered to be reprinted 100,000 copies of House Document 210 of the 83d Congress, entitled "How Our Laws Are Made," by Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary, to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of 90 days after which time the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ELECTRICAL OR MECHANICAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT FOR USE OF MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 250) to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, which was read twice by its title.

The joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That subsection (c) of the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives," approved March 25, 1953 (2 U. S. C., sec. 112a (c)), is amended by striking out "not more than two of each of."

SEC. 2. The first section of such joint resolution is further amended by adding after subsection (c) thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Except in case of electric typewriters, not more than two of each of the general types of equipment described in subsection (c) may be furnished under this joint resolution for use in the office of a Member, officer, or committee."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

PUBLICATION OF THE YALTA PAPERS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for not more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this week the official State Department documents on the Yalta Conference were released. I do not intend to go into this subject in any detail today, but I do wish to make several observations which I think may be of interest to the Senate and to the country.

First of all, the Yalta Conference itself was held from February 4 to February 11, 1945. A brief communique was issued February 12, 1945. After his return home President Franklin D. Roosevelt reported to a joint session of Congress on March 1, 1945.

At this time I wish to direct the attention of Members of the Senate to that report, which appears in the permanent edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 2, March 1, 1945, beginning on page 1618 and extending through pages 1619, 1620, and 1621, and ending on page 1622, where the message to the joint session in the Chamber of the House concludes.

The significant feature of that speech, which I have read and reread, is that, after a condensation of the discussions which took place at Yalta concerning the European phases of the program, there appears this paragraph—and I quote it precisely as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from the speech of the President of the United States making an official report to the two Houses of Congress, a coequal branch of the Government, sitting in joint session:

> Quite naturally this conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe, and not with the Pacific war.

I can thoroughly understand, in wartime, the necessity of not making certain documents available for general public use. I can understand an expression wherein a President of the United States, reporting to a coequal branch of the Government, might say that in the national interest it was not well to discuss certain matters in public. I can understand, under certain circumstances, his making no mention of the situation at all in a public session. But I think—and I say it reluctantly—that that report comes near to being what, in the Army, we called a "false official report" to a coequal branch of the Government of the United States.

I doubt if any person holding the office of President of the United States has the right to mislead the Congress. The fact of the matter is, as everyone knows, that the Yalta conferences dealt with many problems in the Pacific, including China, including Japan, including Korea, including the Sakhalin Islands, and the Kuriles. The Yalta Conference dealt with a great many problems in the Pacific.

V–E Day occurred on May 7, 1945. V–J Day occurred on August 14, 1945. These dates are important, I believe.

Requests for the Yalta agreement by congressional committees and Members of Congress were denied. I am speaking now only of the period subsequent to August 14, 1945, when the fighting in the Pacific stopped. For the remainder of that year, during all of 1946, and until March 24, 1947, requests of Members of Congress were denied. It was not until March 24, 1947, that the texts of the agreements themselves were made public. That means that for a period of more than a year and a half after the war had ended and the security problem was no longer involved, the actual texts of the agreements themselves were not made public or supplied to Members of Congress.

It was not until 8 years after the publication of the agreements and 10 years after the conference that other documents relating to the Yalta Conference, released this week, were finally made available to the Congress of the United States.

Prior to this week Members of Congress could get a piecemeal view of the Yalta Conference by reading various books which deal with the subject. Several of them have been called to my attention. I have personally read the following:

As He Saw It, the story of the world conferences of F. D. R., by Elliott Roosevelt, his son, who accompanied him to the several conferences. This book was published in the year 1946.

Triumph and Tragedy, volume VI, Second World War Memoirs of Sir Winston Churchill, published in 1953.

Roosevelt and the Russians—the Yalta Conference—by the late Edward Stettinius, Jr., formerly Secretary of State, published in 1949.

Speaking Frankly, by James F. Byrnes, published in 1947.

I Was There, by Admiral William D. Leahy, published in 1950.

In addition, there was the very excellent book by Mr. Sherwood, on Roosevelt and Hopkins, which throws some additional light on the Yalta Conference.

It is clear from the papers released this week that Stalin refused to meet anywhere except on Soviet soil. The Russians supplied the household help. We know that subsequently they planted electronic devices in an American Embassy in a Communist country. Is there any reason to believe that they had not provided similar devices in the Czar's summer palace, and other buildings set aside for conference purposes?

Granted that there may be valid reasons for withholding public release of information in time of war, does any President have the moral right to give misinformation to a coequal branch of the Government? When a war is over and security is no longer an issue, is it good public policy to deny the text of such an agreement as Yalta to committees and Members of Congress? Remember V–J Day was August 14, 1945, and the text of the agreement was denied to committees and Members of Congress until March 24, 1947, a period of 19 months. The background information was withheld for a period of almost 10 years. In reaching decisions should Members of Congress have to depend upon private memoirs, biographies, and books?

In the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning there is a lead editorial which begins as follows:

Publication of the Yalta papers reopens old wounds and opens a lot of new ones. The papers show no secret engagements whatsoever. Alger Hiss is revealed not as a principal architect of anything, but as a technician working among other technicians by the side of the American member of the Big Three.

No responsible individual that I know of has ever claimed that Alger Hiss was a principal architect in the Yalta Conference or, indeed, even a chief negotiator. However, he was there. He sat in numerous conferences, and was not limited to listening to or participating only in the United Nations phases of the situation. If the Soviet Union had advance access to our positions and policies, it would be like a man playing poker with a mirror at his back, in which his opponent could see his hand before the play began.

Perhaps the most detailed account of the Yalta Conference until the recent publication was Mr. Stettinius' book. He was Secretary of State at the time of the Yalta Conference. Presumably he was the President's chief adviser on foreign policy, though I think it is fair to say that probably the President was acting more or less as his own Secretary of State. But I refer those who have tried to indicate that Mr. Hiss played no important part at Yalta to Secretary of State Stettinius' book. On page 30, for example, he mentions that Mr. Hiss was there as Deputy Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs. He mentions the various conferences he attended.

On page 83, Secretary of State Stettinius says:

My usual daily schedule, for instance, was to confer with Matthews, Bohlen, and Hiss just after I got up in the morning. I next discussed conference problems with the President.

On the same page he says:

After these dinners I usually conferred again with Matthews, Bohlen, Hiss, and Foote.

On page 103 of the same book, former Secretary of State Stettinius says:

The Americans, sitting behind the President, varied somewhat from session to session but usually included Hopkins, Matthews, and Hiss, and sometimes Foote.

On page 138 the Secretary writes:

I sat at the President's right. Behind the President sat Hopkins, Matthews, and Hiss.

On pages 196 and 197 former Secretary of State Stettinius mentions that, in dealing with the question of multiple voting in the United Nations, that question had been taken up in a subcommittee on which Hiss was the American representative.

Mr. President, I call this subject to the attention of the Senate because in the light of subsequent developments, particularly the conviction of Hiss for giving perjured testimony relating to turning over secret documents of the Government of the United States to an espionage ring in this country, it is apparent that Hiss did not have to be an active negotiator and did not have to be a principal architect at the conferences to do great damage. All he had to do was to sit in and be privy to the information available at the conferences in order to be able to do tremendous harm to the Government of the United States and to the people of the United States and, indeed, to the President he was supposed to be loyally serving.

At a later date I intend to go into the subject in some detail. I believe there is a great deal of information in the documents which have just been made available which will throw much light on this important subject. I believe these matters should be explored, not for any purpose of stirring up acrimony or reopening old wounds, but in an attempt to make certain that never again in its history will our country participate in a meeting such as the one held at Yalta, and place the lives and liberties of millions of people throughout the world in jeopardy in a secret conference in which the nations that are bartered away have no voice or vote in the making of decisions which so vitally affect their ultimate destiny.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall not ask that I be permitted to speak for 10 minutes, or any length of time, on the subject of these papers whose release has electrified the capitals of the free world. But I believe that I should make a very brief statement at this time. I do not plan that it shall be my last statement on the subject.

I realize that I am not sufficiently versed in international diplomatic customs to render a positive and final judgment on the effect of the action taken by the Secretary of State. Nor have I had an opportunity to give these bulky documents, which were laid on my desk the day before yesterday, the thorough consideration they deserve.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, according to the New York Times today, the distinguished occupant of the Chair, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE], who has spent a lifetime in the study of this problem, has stated that the publication of the papers will have "a bad effect" on our international relations.

The publication of the papers raises some disturbing thoughts. Since this is an administration which is so strongly committed to the concept of responsibility, I must assume that the Secretary of State had a highly responsible purpose in mind when he released the documents. Surely they were not released merely for the sake of disposing of excess papers in the files of the State Department.

It has been my belief that the objective of the State Department should be to gear all its activities to winning the cold war and to preserving the United States from the menace of communism. That, we believe, is the basis of the bipartisanship which we Democrats have so willingly and cheerfully and wholeheartedly advanced. The Democrats have no intention of altering their approach to foreign relations.

We believe that every American would rather win the cold war against communism than win a cold war against another political party.

Frankly, I do not know the purpose that will be served by the hasty publication this week of these documents. I do not know what purpose will be served, so far as the unity and the determination of the freeworld is concerned, by hasty comments on paragraphs of this bulky release.

I do know that the press this morning relates that one of the participants at the conference has already challenged the accuracy of the papers. I do know that the press is full of comments from distinguished experts in the field of diplomacy, who indicate that they are very uneasy over the results that may flow from publishing the papers.

We must face the fact that the publication of these papers may have—at least for the immediate future—ended international conferences at which participants will fully and freely discuss with each other the problems of the world.

Mr. President, I suggest that we let the record show that we will have to leave it to the judgment of history to determine whether this move this week was intended to promote the cause of freedom and of America and of the free world, or whether we submerged international relations to purely domestic political considerations.

REMARKS ON REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks with respect to the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

The committee report does recognize that "the President's Economic Report looks for a continued advance in general economic activity" in that "it is reasonable to expect that within the coming year we can approximate the levels of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power envisage by section 2

of the Employment Act." The committee report concludes that these levels seem "to imply national production of about $375 billion for the year as a whole, with a year-end rate of about $385 billion, on the basis of committee staff projections," and that "most of the witnesses at the recent committee hearings warned, that during the second half of the year, the advance may be less than during the first half."

The implication of these statements obviously is that the economy will not reach that level of economic activity which the President's report indicates that it in all probability will reach.

The latest expert opinions, however, seem to indicate, quite to the contrary, that a gross national product of $375 billion will in all probability be achieved. For example, the March 14 issue of Newsweek magazine concludes:

The wary economists who have been looking for a production letdown in the last half of the year are not so sure now. And even the optimists are beginning to raise their sights. * * *

The way things look now, barring a major strike, 1955 could wind up with gross national product at a breathtaking $375 billion. Top officials privately expect the year's first quarter to show the Nation's output of goods and services running around $368 billion. The all-time high, set in the second quarter of 1953, was $370 billion.

The reported change in expert opinion, therefore, should impress upon the public the need for viewing such economic projections as those relied upon by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, with a great deal of caution and reserve.

The economic outlook for 1955 is indeed excellent, and the American people can have faith in the President's statement that:

The Nation's output within the coming year will approximate the goals of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power envisaged by the Employed Act.

Mr. President, I ask that this article from Newsweek, entitled "The Periscope—Business Trends," be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PERISCOPE—BUSINESS TRENDS

RAISING THE SIGHTS

The wary economists who have been looking for a production letdown in the last half of the year are not so sure now. And even the optimists are beginning to raise their sights.

Many top administration officials still think the astounding automobile production race will have to gear down. But they are no longer so positive the deceleration has to be drastic.

One of Detroit's most optimistic—and accurate—forecasters, General Motors president Harlow Curtice, now predicts a 7.5 million-car year. That would mean sales and production volume some 20 percent over 1954's—and a new record. Earlier, Curtice was talking of a 10 percent gain for 1955.

The way things look now, barring a major strike, 1955 could wind up with gross national product at a breath-taking $375 billion. Top officials privately expect the year's first quarter to show the Nation's ouput of goods and services running around $368 billion. The all-time high, set in the second quarter of 1953, was $370 billion.

PRESSURE ON PRICES

The industrial barometers, however, are also showing pressures building up for a fresh price spiral, starting in the basic metals.

The worldwide tight supply of copper has already inflated its price tag. Aluminum ingots recently climbed a cent a pound. Steel looks to be next.

The makings of a steel spiral are already here. The industry is braced for one increase when this year's wage negotiations with the steelworkers' union take place.

The workings of the steel market will very likely pile another price hike on top of that one.

THE RAW MATERIALS

Bidding by Europe's—and later, Japan's—reawakened steel mills neutralized United States companies' efforts to check a runaway in prices of steel scrap. Scrap is up to close to $37 a ton, compared with less than $30 last September.

Now American steelmakers need more scrap and the outlook is for scrap prices to keep right on going. The other ingredients that feed the blast furnaces are bound to follow. (That was the pattern in copper.) Iron-ore prices have inched upward; limestone, pig iron, and coking coal will do the same.

Aluminum, the No. 1 substitute when copper or steel turn hard to get, is no longer plentiful. Aluminum makers, whose expansion plans were stymied by Washington last year, are working hard to catch up now—with costs higher.

THE HUNGRY CUSTOMERS

Predictions that steel demand would slack off during the last half of this year now seem very shaky.

Even if auto production lines eased up on their voracious steel consumption, steelmakers would still have plenty of customers. For one thing, steel inventories have been worked way down and steel users are anxious to replenish them.

The railroads, which cut plant and equipment spending in 1954, are ready to resume at their old $1 billion-a-year rate.

The steel industry itself (and it's one of its own best customers) had ticketed about $700 million earlier this year for expansion. Now there is talk that this will not be enough.

The administration's $101 billion road program opens up fresh markets for steel—not only for the metal that will go into the roads themselves, but also for the army of road-building machines the project will need.

RAILROADS PULL AHEAD

The pellmell rush of industrial activity has started the railroads clicking faster, too. So far this year, carloadings have been running more than 2 percent ahead of last year—and the lines usually don't roll out of their winter slump until March.

Significantly, the margin of improvement over last year's figures has been steadily widening.

Railroadmen expect the second quarter to improve still further, with a good chance that traffic for the year will wind up about 3 percent better than 1954. This would put profits much higher.

REPORT OF HOOVER COMMISSION TASK FORCE ON FEDERAL MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on February 19, a task force on Federal Medical Services of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government, better known as the Hoover Commission, filed its report.

This report recommends the closing of 19 Veterans' Administration hospitals. Two of these hospitals are located in Kentucky. One is at Fort Thomas, Ky., the other is at Outwood, Ky.

The Hoover Commission report of February 28, transmits the report of its task force. This report does not make the same recommendation as that made by the task force. It asks that Administrator of the Veterans' Administration "consider the recommendations made by the task force as to closing of certain hospitals and obtain the advice of the proposed Federal Advisory Council of Health on these recommendations."

Mr. President, this does not, in my view, minimize the threat to these hospitals, which have been accomplishing outstanding work in the treatment of our veterans.

The hospital at Fort Thomas has a capacity of 395 patients, but there are now 404 patients in the hospital, 9 more than the capacity.

The hospital at Outwood has done an excellent job in the treatment of tuberculosis cases. Most of the veterans at this hospital are from the area and by receiving treatment at Outwood they are able to have the benefit and joys of visits from their family and friends.

The majority of the patients at Outwood are veterans of World War I. Their average age is 62, and since they have been ill for many years they have not been able to build up social-security benefits and other sources of income which would make it possible for them to live their remaining years with a measure of security and care, except that which is given them at this hospital.

Apparently, Mr. President, the recommendation for closing these hospitals does not come from any lack of need for such facilities. I quote from the report of the task force itself to show that Veterans' Administration hospitals are desperately needed. Page 56 of this report states the following:

There has been an increase in the total patient load in VA hospitals in the past year. Although the patient load is apparently now in equilibrium, the continued increase in the number of veterans and the aging of the present veteran population can be expected to increase the pressures for more veterans' hospital construction in the future.

It is apparent also that the proposal to close these hospitals does not reflect the attitudes and desires of those who live near these installations and those who have observed their workings and their benefits.

I have had correspondence and discussions with many from Kentucky who speak forcefully of the need for these hospitals.

Only last week, leaders of the Kentucky Department of the American Legion were in Washington at the National Rehabilitation Conference. Meeting with State Commander Rodney Brown and his staff, I discussed the matter of closing these hospitals. He presented the strongest opposition to this action and stated that it would weaken the veterans' program immeasurably in Kentucky and in the surrounding areas served by both Outwood and Fort Thomas.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD resolutions and communications I have received which pertain to the recommendations of the task force.

There being no objection, the resolutions and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution protesting the closing of the Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital

Whereas it is the feeling of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newport, Ky., that the closing of the Fort Thomas Hospital would directly affect more than 100 families of Newport, Ky., who have patients or are employees of the hospital; and

Whereas it would also cause a loss of revenue to merchants of the city of Newport, Ky.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newport, Ky.:

SECTION I. That the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newport, Ky., does by this resolution, protest the closing of the Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital, Fort Thomas, Ky.

SEC. II. That a copy of this resolution of protest be sent to the Senators, Representatives, and Veterans' Administration officials.

SEC. III. That this resolution shall be signed by the mayor, attested by the city clerk, recorded and published. Same shall be in effect at the earliest time provided by law.

Adopted this the 11th day of March 1955.

ROBERT L. SIDELL,
Mayor.

Attest:

ROBERT SCHOMAKER,
City Clerk, Acting.

BROTHERHOOD OF PAINTERS, DECORATORS, AND PAPERHANGERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL UNION NO. 215,
Newport, Ky., March 7, 1955.

Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS.

DEAR SIR: At our last regular meeting I was instructed to write you, asking you to do everything in your power to prevent the closing of the Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital. It is a big help to the merchants and working people of this community and would be sorely missed if closed, especially by the painters. We have four men under civil service, who work there steady, and each year a number of others get work on the purchase and hire plan, when they do extra work at the hospital. It has been responsible for hundreds of man-days for painters in this district, and would be a big loss to us for we have lost so much work to the "do it yourself" campaign that our craft is in a depression hereabouts. Thanking you for anything you can do.

I am,

JAMES J. BURNS,
Recording Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, KENTUCKY,
Campbell County, Ky., February 28, 1955.

Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CLEMENTS: On page 1 of the Kentucky Times-Star, issue of February 26, 1955, is an 8 column heading, saying in part: "Closing of VA Hospital Rumored, Fort Thomas Hospital Is Listed Among 19 To Be Discontinued." The Hoover Commission will report to Congress Monday and it will recommend the closing of the Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital.

As a disabled veteran of World War I, and having served for four terms as a member of the Kentucky House of Representatives, and at nearly every session having served as a member of the House Veterans Committee and also having served since its inception as a member of the local committee to promote the work of the hospital at Fort Thomas, Ky., and knowing the needs of and the services rendered by this hospital, I am emphatically opposed to such a reported move and urge upon you to use the powerful influences of your good offices to prevent the closing of this hospital, at this time, or any other time.

There are now 404 patients at the Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital and 9 more than the capacity of the institution, and I can't understand why anyone would recommend its closing when it is rendering such a great and efficient service to our sick and disabled veterans.

Therefore, I urgently recommend that when this report is presented to Congress that you use every means at your command to defeat this move to close our local VA hospital.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. WIRSCH,
Representative, 62d Kentucky District.

AMERICAN WAR DADS,
KENTUCKY STATE ASSOCIATION,
Louisville, Ky., March 1, 1955.

Senator EARLE CLEMENTS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CLEMENTS: The American War Dads of Kentucky are very much opposed to the bill to close veterans hospitals in any part of the United States.

We, as a patriotic organization, are aware of the need of veteran hospitals.

Therefore, we ask that you oppose the bill when it comes before the Senate.

With every good wish to you personally.

Respectfully yours,

WM. G. TOMPKINS,
President.

LADIES' AUXILIARY,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
KERSTEN-O'DAY POST NO. 2899,
Bellevue-Dayton, Ky., February 28, 1955.

Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CLEMENTS: Through the local press the public has been informed that the VA Hospital at Fort Thomas, Ky., is to be closed.

The Ladies' Auxiliary to Kersten-O'Day Post No. 2899, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Bellevue and Dayton, Ky., would like to go on record as opposing this action. In the interest of the veterans we beg that you exert whatever power you have in protesting such a measure.

The VA Hospital has served long and well in this community and all civic, patriotic and fraternal organizations are doing everything possible to assist in the rehabilitation of the patients. From our observations it seems that the hospital is functioning in an excellent manner.

Anything you can do will be sincerely appreciated by our organization.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. HELEN S. FRENCH,
Legislative Chairman.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DIVISION OF PUBLICITY,
Frankfort, Ky., March 3, 1955.

Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Knowing of your interest in the Outwood Veterans' Hospital, I am confident that you were disappointed with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission which suggested the closing of Outwood hospital.

Your many friends in Dawson Springs and the communities of Princeton, Hopkinsville, and Madisonville, along with all persons interested in the welfare of our veterans, will appreciate your efforts in providing for the continued operation and maintenance of Outwood hospital.

With kindest personal regards and all best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

MACK SISK,
Director.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is evident from these communications, Mr. President, that the interest in continuing both Outwood and Fort Thomas VA hospitals is the matter of great concern. They represent a broad segment of the community.

No responsible veterans organization, no individual veteran, or anyone interested in the well-being of those who have served their Nation faithfully and honorably, desire more for the veteran than he deserves.

But by the same token, Mr. President, those who have served their Nation, and particularly those who are in the need of mental and physical care, should not have taken from them the facilities to live a better, longer, and healthier life.

TALENT IRRIGATION PROJECT IN SOUTHERN OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, during the past 2 weeks, a number of employees of various agencies of the Department of Interior have been testifying before committees of Congress in behalf of authorization of the upper Colorado storage project. The administration has thrown platoon after platoon of engineers, heads of administrative agencies, and technical experts into the lines to support this project which entails expenditure of about $1,500,000,000.

I do not at this time intend to explain my position on the upper Colorado proposal; but, because of the administration's attitude on an important reclamation project in the State of Oregon, this display of support raises an important and unresolved question.

I have been advised by the Bureau of Reclamation that the benefit-cost ratio of the upper Colorado River storage project with 11 participating projects is 1.31 to 1. The President's 1956 budget has tentatively earmarked $10 million for the Colorado project if it is approved by Congress. The Bureau also advised me that the irrigation benefit-cost ratio for the Talent project in southern Oregon is 1.30 to 1. Following its authorization last year, Republican Party candidates used the Talent project as a springboard for political celebrations. Yet this year, not a single dollar is provided in the budget for this necessary and beneficial project.

I wonder if this is to become the administration's policy on irrigation projects—to push for project authorization and then withdraw interest when it comes time to make the project a reality through construction? The upper Colorado River project and the Talent project have virtually identical benefit-cost features. Talent is authorized, but no construction funds are available. Will the administration's interest in the upper Colorado project suddenly wane after authorization is won, as it apparently

and unfortunately did in the case of the Talent project?

The administration's attitude on the Talent project is a betrayal of the people of southern Oregon. I shall continue to do all in my power to bring about appropriations for the Talent project, which compares favorably to undertakings the administration is promoting elsewhere in the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Commissioner of Reclamation with reference to this important question be printed at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 18, 1955.

Mr. WILBUR A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DEXHEIMER: During the last 2 weeks numerous employees of the Bureau of Reclamation have testified before the Senate and House Interior and Insular Affairs Committees relative to authorization of the upper Colorado River storage project. Testimony presented by yourself and others in the Bureau of Reclamation indicates a strong desire by the administration to obtain approval of this project, entailing expenditure of about $1,500,000,000.

According to information received from the Acting Commissioner on March 15, 1955, the benefit-cost ratio of the upper Colorado project for irrigation is 1.31 to 1.00. The President's budget for fiscal 1956 has earmarked $10 million for the Colorado storage project if approved by Congress. The Acting Commissioner also advised that the irrigation benefit-cost ratio for the Talent project in southern Oregon is 1.30 to 1.00. However, the budget does not earmark a single dollar for construction of this already-authorized project.

Since the upper Colorado and the Talent project have almost identical benefit-cost features, would you please advise me why the Bureau of Reclamation is pushing for approval of the upper Colorado project but has evidenced no similar interest in construction of the Talent project, which, by virtue of previous authorization, could become productive much sooner? I trust that it has not become the policy of the Bureau to funnel its energies into seeking authorization for projects, but not to follow through and seek immediate construction. If so, I wonder whether the Bureau—if the upper Colorado project is authorized—will lose interest in seeking construction funds for it, as has apparently and unfortunately been the case with the Talent project?

I would greatly appreciate it if you would advise me immediately as to plans of the Bureau of Reclamation in recommending the appropriation of funds for construction of the Talent project. In my opinion, this project should be undertaken immediately and the necessary funds made available.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

PROTECTION OF CONSUMERS OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier today it was my privilege to introduce to President Eisenhower an outstanding delegation of State and municipal law officers from all over the country who had come to present to the President the case for protection of consumers as regards natural gas rates.

In the course of our visit, we submitted to the Chief Executive a statement signed by all the members of the delegation for this objective.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement containing the signatures of those present be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVES OF CONSUMERS TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER OPPOSING DESTRUCTION OF CONSUMER PROTECTIONS UNDER THE NATURAL GAS ACT

We are pleased and honored to have this opportunity as representatives of natural gas consumers to present certain facts on their behalf. We are here to urge you not to approve proposed legislation[1] which will destroy the Natural Gas Act's protections for consumers.

We do not speak for any special interest, or group. We do speak for millions of consumers—little people who are unable to speak to you personally on their own behalf. We ask no special favor or exemption. Our plea is limited to a request that you do not approve any bill which allows any seller of natural gas in interstate commerce, for resale, to exploit consumers by charging unreasonable prices. It is our basic position that consumers are entitled to protection against unreasonable prices.

There were 19,959,200 national gas customer connections in the United States in 1953.[2] Of these, 18,386,200 were residential. In round numbers there are approximately 60 million residential natural gas users affected.[3]

We report to you that our people are tremendously alarmed at this legislative drive to scuttle effective regulation of natural gas rates. Most consumers have experienced one or more natural gas rate increases already in the past 3 years. And we estimate that increases from $200 million to $400 million yearly will eventually flow from this proposed congressional action.

NATURAL GAS ACT AIMED PRIMARILY AT PREVENTING CONSUMER EXPLOITATION

In several cases the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that "the primary aim of this legislation (the Natural Gas Act of 1938) was to protect consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural gas companies."[4]

Under this act, the Federal Power Commission has jurisdiction to determine whether rates charged in all sales of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale by producers, gatherers, pipelines, or any other person are just and reasonable. The act requires that the FPC allow natural gas companies a just and reasonable rate of return; these companies may compel the granting of such a return by appeal to the courts.

The Natural Gas Act grew out of an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission which revealed price gouging and exploitation of consumers by sellers of natural gas in interstate commerce. The Supreme Court of the United States had previously held in two landmark decisions[5] that neither the State of origin nor the State of destination could control the rates charged by these sellers in interstate commerce. The Court held that under the Constitution, the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction in this field. The act was thus adopted to bridge this gap in Federal-State jurisdiction by providing Federal protections for consumers which the States may not constitutionally provide.[6] If the act is amended as proposed in pending bills, then the price at which gas enters the pipelines will not be subject to any real regulation and all consumer protection will be effectively destroyed. With Federal protection removed, and the States constitutionally helpless to protect consumers, an unregulated—and unprotected—twilight zone would result.

CONSUMER PROTECTION UNDER ACT

A Federal Power Commission study shows that from 1938, when the Natural Gas Act went into effect, until 1946 the Commission conducted numerous rate investigations resulting in rate reductions to consumers aggregating in excess of $157 million in such cities as Detroit, Kansas City, Cleveland, Fort Wayne, Dallas, and other cities located in Illinois, Kansas, Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and other States.[7] This experience demonstrates that the consumers needed protection and that the act provided such protection.

However, large and continuing increases in field prices and the general inflationary trend caused the FPC to grant higher rates. Some half billion dollars of gas rate increases have been filed at the FPC in the past 5½ years. During the fiscal year 1954, gas rate increase applications in the amount of $286,800,000 were under consideration. Of this total, $106,900,000 has already been allowed.[8]

A tremendous network of pipelines now bring natural gas to nearly all the major cities in the Nation. The pipelines were built for the most part under the present act and under the representation that natural gas would be made available to consumers at a reasonable rate. Municipalities and consumers supported this pipeline development in reliance on these representations. Local distribution companies have instituted, city by city, a changeover in equipment as natural gas became available. Consumers are now absolutely dependent upon those who sell gas in interstate commerce for resale. Natural gas is now a public service commodity just as are water, electricity, and other historically regulated public service commodities. Stoves, heating units, and hot water heaters have been converted to this fuel at an expense of millions of dollars. Consumers have invested $10 billion in this gas-burning equipment—an investment which we believe exceeds the value of all other investments in the natural gas industry. Gas is the only fuel that can be utilized by this equipment. Consumers cannot change suppliers if the particular company upon whom they have become dependent increases the price. Distributors are committed under long-term contracts to buy gas from the pipeline which serves them at a price fixed by the FPC. Interstate pipelines in turn are bound to sellers in a given field or fields by the physical location of their pipelines, which cannot readily be moved to a new field in search of a better price. Unless the FPC has jurisdiction to control that initial price

[1] The major bill is the Harris bill (H. R. 4560). Other pending bills of similar purpose are H. R. 3703, 3902, 3940, 3941, 4168, 4214, and 4675.

[2] Gas Facts (1953), p. 91 (published by American Gas Association, Bureau of Statistics). These are the latest available figures.

[3] This is computed by estimating three persons per residential connection.

[4] *Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.* (320 U. S. 591, 610); *Phillips Petroleum Company* v. *State of Wisconsin* (347 U. S. 672).

[5] *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Attleboro Steam and Electric Co.* (273 U. S. 83); *Missouri* v. *Kansas Natural Gas Co.* (265 U. S. 258).

[6] In its official reports Congress said the act was "to fill the gap in regulation that now exists by reason of the lack of authority of the State commissions" (H. Rept. 709, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 3; S. Rept. 1162, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 3).

[7] Hearings on H. R. 2185 et al., 80th Cong., 1st sess., p. 463 et seq.

[8] 34th Annual Report, FPC (1954), p. 108.

in the field no effective control exists.[9] Proceedings before the FPC show that there is no competition between sellers and that the only competition is between buyers; who are bidding against each other for gas supplies.

Should the gasoline for his automobile prove unsatisfactory, or should his cigarettes disagree with him, there is the simple expedient open to the user of changing brands. But the only choice open to the person who is serviced by a natural gas company, which furnishes the wherewithal to enjoy a warm home, or a hot meal, is to endure whatever the particular inconvenience is or to use another fuel.

This, patently, is no choice at all. Once a person has installed costly gas-burning equipment with which to heat and cook, then the cost of changing to another fuel, measured in terms of time, inconvenience, and most important of all, money, is absolutely prohibitive. Congress was fully aware of these facts when it provided that the Federal Power Commission should regulate all sales in interstate commerce for resale. To limit the act to sales by pipelines, as the pending bills propose, eliminating sales to pipelines in interstate commerce would be to ignore obvious evils which the present act eliminates.

FABULOUS NATURAL GAS EXPANSION UNDER ACT

That the act as now written is beneficial to sellers of gas in interstate commerce, for resale, is amply demonstrated by the record of the past 17 years.

Sales of natural gas have increased from 1,200 billion cubic feet in 1938 to 5,319 billion cubic feet in 1953.[10] The number of customer connections increased from 6,742,000 in 1938 to 19,959,200 in 1953.[11] Pipeline mileage increased from 184,900 in 1938 to 393,890 in 1953.[12] Revenues increased from $406,352,000 in 1938 to $2,250,120,000 in 1953.[13]

Based upon the number of consumers dependent upon natural gas for heating and cooking, the natural-gas industry has increased some 300 percent since 1938. This industry is gigantic in size and tremendous in its effect upon the national economy. It must be subject to the closest scrutiny and regulation to insure equal justice both to sellers of gas in interstate commerce and consumers. Consumers definitely are on an unequal footing with the natural-gas industry. If the act is amended so that the FPC cannot protect them, then no one can.[14]

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION—A $200 MILLION TO $400 MILLION YEARLY BOOST IN CONSUMER GAS BILLS

All of the proposed bills in Congress in effect prohibit the FPC from fixing reasonable rates to be charged by sellers of natural gas in interstate commerce in sales taking place prior to the time the gas enters the large interstate pipelines.

In addition, the Harris bill (H. R. 4560) would compel the Federal Power Commission to allow pipeline companies for their produced gas the prevailing market price for the gas in the field where the gas is produced.

The effect of such a basic change in consumer protection is dramatically illustrated in a pending rate increase case involving the city of Denver.[15] In that case Colorado Interstate Pipeline Co. has asked that this field price theory be substituted for the established method of regulation which bases prices on cost plus a reasonable rate of return. According to the figures presented there, this change means an increase in rates to consumers in the Denver area of approximately $4 million per year—and the company claims its field rate there is not as high as it should be. Many other cities will be similarly affected if the proposed legislation is enacted by Congress.

When the Kerr bill was considered by the Congress in 1949–50, the FPC estimated conservatively that a 5 cents per thousand cubic feet increase would flow from its adoption, resulting in a $200 million per year increase to consumers.[16] That an increase of $400 million per year, for consumers is probably now a conservative estimate of the effect of the pending bills is amply demonstrated by the great increase in reserves, markets, sales, and natural gas prices since 1950. Regardless of amount, the result of the adoption of the proposed legislation would certainly be unregulated and unreasonable prices—as witness the Denver case already mentioned.

REASONS ADVANCED FOR BILLS TO REMOVE CONSUMER PROTECTION ARE UNSOUND

The major reason advanced in support of the bills to remove existing consumer protections from the Natural Gas Act is that sellers of natural gas in interstate commerce need the removal of these consumer protections to encourage them to produce the needed natural gas. This is a familiar scare technique. It is respectfully submitted that the 27½ percent tax exemption now enjoyed by these natural gas sellers and the prices received are sufficient encouragement without this additional exemption allowing the charging of any price the traffic will bear. The tremendous growth of the industry under the existing law proves this.

In urging passage of this legislation, the industry lays great stress on the 4,000 small producers of natural gas but fails to mention that 85 percent of all the natural gas sold in interstate commerce for resale is produced by less than 100 companies—most of them oil companies—and that one-third of the supply is furnished by 7 companies. The fact is that a few big oil companies make most of the sales; it is these companies which have fought against FPC regulation since 1938 by litigation, legislative efforts, and other methods. The repeated mention of 4,000 small producers is a smokescreen intended to obscure the true situation.

Despite claims to the contrary, FPC regulation of rates charged for sales in interstate commerce for resale does not result in interference with State conservation powers.[17] The Supreme Court considered hundreds of pages of testimony, briefs, and argument on this exact issue and then expressly so held in the Phillips case. Since the States cannot constitutionally control sales for resale—even at the wellhead—if they are in interstate commerce, there can be no conflict of State-Federal power. Some States fix minimum prices to protect landowners, producers, and royalty owners. No State does fix, or can constitutionally fix, rates for sales in interstate commerce to protect consumers.

REGULATION TO PROTECT HELPLESS LITTLE PEOPLE UNDER FREE-ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

It is a basic tenet of our free-enterprise system that the helpless little fellow must be protected from those in a position to exploit him. We have antitrust laws, laws requiring fair and truthful advertising, a minimum wage law, and a whole series of other regulatory acts designed for this express purpose. The Natural Gas Act, with its "primary aim of preventing exploitation of consumers," fits clearly within the basic tenets of our free-enterprise system and should not be changed so as to place these helpless little people at the mercy of sellers of natural gas in interstate commerce. It must be kept in mind that this is regulation of an essential public service and not an unreasonable interference with private business or private ownership of business.

It is contrary to the traditions of our free-enterprise system, whereby Government regulations are designed to protect the weak who cannot protect themselves, to subject these thousands of helpless consumers to exploitation by the great oil and gas companies—the real sponsors of this proposed legislation. These companies are seeking a congressional edict freeing them from all possible controls whereby consumers can be protected against their exploitations.

Finally, no practical difficulties are involved requiring passage of the pending legislation. That argument was likewise presented in the Phillips case to the Supreme Court of the United States and rejected, the Court stating:

"Regulation of the sales in interstate commerce for resale made by a so-called independent natural-gas producer is not essentially different from regulation of such sales when made by an affiliate of an interstate pipeline company. In both cases, the rates charged may have a direct and substantial effect on the price paid by the ultimate consumers. Protection of consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural-gas companies was the primary aim of the Natural Gas Act."

Respectfully submitted.

Alexander Wiley; William G. Callow, City Attorney, Waukesha, Wis.; Peter Campbell Brown, Corporation Counsel, New York, N. Y.; Abraham L. Freedman, City Solicitor, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ralph S. Locher, Director of Law, Cleveland, Ohio; James H. Lee, Special Corporation Counsel (utilities), Detroit, Mich.; John J. Mortimer, Corporation Counsel, Chicago, Ill.; Harry G. Slater, First Assistant City Attorney, Milwaukee, Wis.; David M. Proctor, City Counselor, Kansas City, Mo.; John C. Banks, City Attorney, Denver, Colo.; Charles S. Rhyne, General Counsel, NIMLO, Washington, D. C.; Andrew Broaddus, Mayor, Louisville, Ky.; Vernon W. Thompson, Attorney General, State of Wisconsin; Stewart G. Honeck, Deputy Attorney General, State of Wisconsin; Benson Trimble, Nashville, Tenn.; H. J. O'Leary, Public Service Commission, Madison, Wis.

MARCH 18, 1955.

---

[9] That all of this increase would be paid by consumers is beyond question. In *Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (331 U. S. 682, 692–693), the Supreme Court said of prices at the origin or producing and gathering stage: "Unreasonable charges exacted at this stage of the interstate movement become perpetuated in large part in fixed items of costs which must be covered by rates charged subesquent purchasers of gas, including the ultimate consumer. It was to avoid such situations that the Natural Gas Act was passed."

[10] Gas Facts (1953), p. 107.

[11] Ibid., p. 86.

[12] Ibid., p. 58.

[13] Ibid., p. 128.

[14] The Cabinet committee in its Report on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy states in part that "We believe the problem of natural-gas regulation should be approached from the viewpoint of assuring reasonable prices to consumers." But the proposed legislation removes all power to assure reasonable prices to consumers.

[15] FPC Docket Nos. G–2260 and G–2576.

[16] Hearings on S. 1498, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. 16, table 10, and p. 283.

[17] The act prohibits FPC regulation of production and gathering.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in executive session, and the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar, the consideration of which is now in order.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Campbell, of New York, to be Comptroller General of the United

States for a term of 15 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in considering the confirmation of Joseph Campbell to be Comptroller General of the United States it must be borne in mind by the Senate that the General Accounting Office is an arm or an agency of the legislative branch of government, rather than of the executive branch. This is clearly apparent from the legislative history of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 which created this agency. Since that time its unique status has been specifically recognized by the Congress in connection with the passage of the various reorganization acts, which have exempted the General Accounting Office from the authority of the President to effect reorganization. The Congress considered that the General Accounting Office was not within the scope of the mission assigned to the Hoover Commission which was created to make recommendations with respect to the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

In our system of government, with its various checks and balances, the Executive is charged with the administration of the laws. This is not to say that the Congress is powerless to influence the way in which the laws it passes are administered. Certainly the Congress, having the power of the purse, has every right and duty to watch over the expenditures of appropriated moneys, and it is not without power to follow through in this respect.

The General Accounting Office was specifically created by the Congress as its agency, as its watchdog, for the purpose of examining and reporting to the Congress with respect to the manner in which appropriated funds are expended, so as to insure that all such expenditures are made in accordance with the law and with the intent of the Congress.

The greatest power yet remaining to the Congress, Mr. President, is the power of the purse. I say, the greatest power remaining to the Congress, because there has been a disproportionate growth of the executive branch of the Government. While the executive branch has grown to enormous proportions, Congress has remained essentially the same as it was in Jefferson's day. We still use Jefferson's Manual in our parliamentary debates. We have essentially the same committee structure, though there have been changes in the membership of committees from time to time. To meet new circumstances new committees have been created, but, essentially Congress remains the same.

Thus the legislative branch has been hard put to cope on a basis of equality with an expanding and powerful executive branch in this era of rapid changes. In order to mitigate this situation the Congress has, from time to time, resorted to the creation of independent agencies and has delegated to such independent agencies specific and legally designated functions. We have found this a useful means, but, Mr. President, we have seen the independence of these independent agencies assaulted by both Democratic and Republican administrations. I am sure that all who have served in Congress, even if only for a few years, have felt the indispensable need for an independent agency such as is the General Accounting Office, specifically responsible to Congress.

Those who have served in Congress for as long as it has been my privilege to serve not only feel but know the necessity for such an independent agency.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to some of the debates in 1920 and 1921, and even further back, when the question of creating the General Accounting Office was before Congress. We find that in 1920 Congress devoted a great deal of effort toward perfecting legislation and establishing procedures to insure that the proposed new agency would, in fact, be independent of the executive branch and not directly responsible to it, but, on the other hand, would be directly and solely responsible to the Congress.

The debates in Congress during the consideration of the legislation which created the General Accounting Office clearly established that the major purpose of the Budget and Accounting Act was to provide Congress with an agency responsible to it alone, in order to enable the legislative branch to obtain, through its own representatives, required information regarding the operations of the executive branch and the expenditure of funds appropriated by Congress. It was held essential that such an agency should be established to enable Congress to keep fully informed regarding the increasing Federal expenditures. Federal expenditures were increasing them, and they have increased now to vastly greater proportions.

Even with the level of expenditures as low as it was at that time, Congress felt that, in order properly to carry out its constitutional functions and to retain its control over Federal expenditures, it was necessary to create an agency responsible to Congress alone.

I wish to read a brief excerpt from the speech of former Representative James W. Good, who was chairman of the House committee which reported the bill:

> It was the intention of the committee that the Comptroller General should be something more than a bookkeeper or accountant, that he should be a real critic and at all times should come to Congress no matter what the political complexion of Congress or the Executive might be and point out inefficiency if he found that money was being misapplied—which is another term for inefficiency—and that he should bring such facts to the notice of the committees having jurisdiction of appropriations.

Thus it can be seen that in seeking to create an agency which would be completely independent of the Executive, Congress was cognizant of the degree to which independence would be directly related to the agency's responsibility to the Congress itself, on the one hand, or to the Executive, on the other hand, or, in a different set of circumstances, to a dual jurisdiction.

A study of the debate shows, further, that Congress at that time felt that the independence of this agency would largely depend upon the power to appoint and the power to remove the official who headed the agency. A review of the legislative history of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 clearly establishes that in the absence of certain constitutional doubts, Congress would have reserved to itself the authority to select the head of its own agency. Much thought was given the possibility, namely, the inclusion in the legislation creating the agency of a provision by which the head of the proposed agency would be appointed by Congress as its agent, without any Presidential influence, control, or action.

As the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who is seated before me, will recognize, because of his great training, talent, and experience as former chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, a constitutional question was involved. In fact, two major objections were raised to the suggestion that Congress itself should appoint the head of its own agency. The first was that to do so might involve a constitutional question as to the authority of Congress to make appointments of Federal officers or to take action which might affect the power of the President over the appointment of such officers; and, second, whether the terms of such officers might be terminated by succeeding Congresses on a possible partisan, political basis.

Congress resolved those doubts, as Congress resolves many doubts, by some understandings among those who exercised the responsibility at that time.

To meet these objections, the appointive power was vested in the President, but under conditions which were designed to create tenure of office on a basis similar to that pertaining to the appointment of Federal judges, in the sense that the appointees would not be removed by the President, but only, in this case, by a resolution of Congress or by impeachment.

The bill as passed by Congress in 1920 provided that the Comptroller General or the Assistant Comptroller General was to serve during good behavior, and could be removed only when either officer "is incapacitated, or has become inefficient, or has been guilty of neglect of duty, or of malfeasance of office, or of any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude and for no other cause and in no other manner, except by impeachment."

It was provided further that whenever action was to be instituted to remove either of these officers under the prescribed conditions, only action by Congress itself, through the adoption of a concurrent resolution, would be effective in bringing about removal.

President Wilson vetoed that bill on June 4, 1920, on the ground that the provision authorizing removal by concurrent resolution of Congress was in violation of the constitutional authority vested in the Chief Executive to remove appointive officers, and that its enactment would be an encroachment on the authority of the President.

That bill, then, did not become law in 1920; but essentially the same bill was reintroduced in the succeeding Congress and, without material change, was signed by the succeeding President on June 10,

1921, and became law. There was, however, this change: The term of office of the Comptroller General was fixed at 15 years. His tenure was limited to one term. Provision was made for removal for cause by Congress by joint resolution instead of by concurrent resolution.

Thus, Mr. President, we see that in the creation of this agency Congress had one resolute purpose. That was to create an agency responsible to Congress, and Congress alone; to create an agency which is just about the only agency Congress has to exercise surveillance over the expenditures of the then vast amounts of money appropriated by the Congress, and the now vastly greater amounts.

That law remains unchanged to date despite efforts to change it. There has been antagonism on the part of the executive branch of the Government toward the General Accounting Office. I have witnessed that antagonism in Democratic administrations. But, as a Member of the legislative branch, I have resisted all efforts to compromise the independence of the General Accounting Office or to compromise its sole responsibility to the legislative branch of government.

I have been told by elder Members of the Congress, both recently and in former years, that back in 1921 there was a sort of gentlemen's understanding, so to speak, that the Comptroller General would be appointed upon recommendation of Congress. The constitutional phrase "advise and consent" with respect to the Comptroller General has never been treated as a mere matter of confirmation. It must not be so treated now.

Mr. President, it is in the light of this legislative background that the pending nomination must be considered. It is in the light of this background, and in the light of the practices through the years since 1921, that the Senate must consider the qualifications of the nominee whose name is now before it. In the present instance it is only through the act of withholding confirmation that the Congress may preserve its traditional rights in the selection of its own agency heads. In this sense the confirmation process differs materially from that pertaining to confirmation of officials of the executive branch, who are, as they should be, responsible to the President.

Moreover, the Senate has a further responsibility. It must guard the rights of the House of Representatives as well as those of the Senate. The power of confirmation is vested in the Senate; the House of Representatives cannot partake of it. Thus, the act has vested in the Senate the responsibility of advising and consenting for the entire legislative branch to the appointment of a Comptroller General.

Mr. President, before going further, I should like to make it clear that the views I express as to the qualifications of Mr. Campbell, the nominee under consideration, are neither personal in nature, partisan in purpose, nor motivated by Mr. Campbell's part in the Dixon-Yates contract. I must suggest that Mr. Campbell's part in the Dixon-Yates contract has by no means added luster to his record. I respectfully submit, however, that it is not controlling, or even a major factor, in the determination of my position or in the position I now lay before the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the junior Senator from Tennessee yield to the senior Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It seems to me, however, that the fact that the person who has been nominated to be Comptroller General was willing to use another independent agency of the Government, to wit, the Atomic Energy Commission, for a purpose entirely foreign to the purposes for which it was formed, certainly does not indicate that he has a proper perspective of the necessity of keeping independent agencies performing the line of duties for which they were created, but, on the other hand, indicates a lack of knowledge on the part of Mr. Campbell as to the operation of the various branches of the Government, which knowledge I certainly would regard as important.

Mr. GORE. I recognize the cogency of the statement which my senior colleague has made. As I indicated, I was displeased that a commissioner of an independent agency would yield the prerogatives of the office to which he had been appointed and to perform the duties of which office he had taken the oath.

I submit, however, that is an illustration of an attitude which Mr. Campbell then entertained and, so far as I know, may still entertain, to which I shall later make reference.

If I may give an illustration, opposition or support of the Dixon-Yates contract is not the measure by which I have attempted to develop my position today. I say now I would gladly support for appointment as Comptroller General such outstanding champions of the Dixon-Yates contract as our former colleague, the Honorable Homer Ferguson, or Representative STERLING COLE, or other Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives. My opposition to Mr. Campbell is more basic. My statement that I would give my support to the two distinguished gentlemen whom I have named for the position of Comptroller General, if they were before the Senate for confirmation, is based upon the fact that they have essential qualifications for the position which Mr. Campbell lacks. Of course I would prefer to see those gentlemen alter their position with respect to the Dixon-Yates contract, but I submit that that would not be the determining or controlling factor in my position.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In creating independent agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, the Panama Canal Railroad, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and many, many others, Congress was careful to prescribe their lines of responsibility and duty. It is the duty of the Comptroller General to see that the congressional intent is strictly followed. He is the watchdog, so to speak, to see that one agency does not get into the business or field of another, and that the various departments and agencies perform their functions properly, along clear-cut lines, as established by Congress.

It is very difficult for me to conceive how a person who was a member of one of those agencies could countenance its use for a purpose foreign to that for which it was created, and to the detriment of the agency itself. I say that because, despite all the argument, we know that this diversion on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission has thwarted our program. We read that the British have gotten ahead of us in the development of reactor piles for the generation of electricity; and there are many other evidences of this situation.

So it is difficult for me to understand how the perpetrator of that kind of misuse of the function of an executive agency can be a proper person to supervise the proper performance of the duties of the independent agency known as the General Accounting Office.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of my distinguished and able senior colleague.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is the duty of the Comptroller General? Is it not to save the money of the people of the United States, and to prevent its use by persons who are grafters or crooks?

Mr. GORE. That is certainly a major part of his function. The function of his office is quasi-judicial, namely, to see to it that the funds appropriated by Congress are expended lawfully, efficiently, and economically.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say that I have a distinct recollection that some years ago the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] rose on this floor and read a letter from Lindsay Warren, in which Mr. Warren said that certain ships which were sold by the Maritime Commission for almost nothing subsequently were insured for hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars; and later, in some instances, when the Government needed the ships during World War II, it had to pay enormous prices in order to buy back the very ships it once had sold for almost nothing.

I remember that Lindsay Warren mentioned that the Standard Oil Co., as I now recall, leased some of the ships for almost nothing, and later charged large sums of money for them when they were used for cargo purposes by the Government. I thought Lindsay Warren did a remarkably fine job when he revealed to the Senator from Vermont some of the things he had discovered when he was Comptroller General.

Certainly in connection with his contacts the Atomic Energy Commission, during his service as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee

has learned that the Tennessee Valley Authority, by building the plant, could have saved between $90 million and $150 million. Yet, Mr. Campbell voted for the Dixon-Yates contract. In the last analysis, the Government will thereby lose between $90 million and $150 million.

The Comptroller General of the United States has the job of auditing, as I understand—I assume that is part of the job, is it not?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. A part of his job will be to audit—I would not say the expense accounts—but to audit the work of the various independent agencies, with the idea of saving money for the taxpayers of the United States. Can the Senator from Tennessee reconcile that responsibility with the nominee's record?

Mr. GORE. I can not. However, I return to the statement I made earlier to my colleague [Mr. KEFAUVER] namely, I hold that the nominee's action with respect to the Dixon-Yates contract is an illustration of a philosophy of government and a personal attitude toward political responsibility that is more disqualifying than his action on that particular contract would be. I should like to develop that point briefly.

As I understand the position of the Atomic Energy Commissioners at that time, they never took the position that they favored the Dixon-Yates contract. In that regard, the Commission yielded to the President. I should like to read from a letter which Mr. Campbell, then Commissioner Campbell, wrote to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I shall not read all the letter; I think the excerpt I shall read will in no way be unfairly interpreted by taking it out of context. The entire letter is printed in the hearings, copies of which are now before the Senate, on page 30. I shall read only a portion of it, to which I invite the attention of the Senator from North Dakota. Before reading it, let me say that the Joint Committee was conducting a study of the structural organization of the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Campbell was offered an opportunity to submit his views, and he did submit his views in this letter written on May 7, 1954:

> The last, and perhaps the most significant comment that I desire to make on the organizational structure of the Atomic Energy Commission, is that it is completely devoid of political responsibility.

Mr. President, I digress to say that Congress created the Atomic Energy Commission as an independent, nonpolitical agency, having in mind the purpose of keeping it in the status of a nonpolitical organization. In fact, of the first 5 Commissioners appointed by a Democratic President, 4 were members of the Republican Party, and the fifth was an independent. So Congress thought it was necessary to have an independent, nonpolitical agency. Yet we find that Mr. Campbell complained because it is not politically responsive.

But I shall read on, and shall let his own words develop his position. I now continue to read:

> We live in a political system under which the people are entitled to call to account their public servants and to replace them through the election process in the event that their performance is unsatisfactory. This Commission, as it is established, is not responsive to the will of the people. It is only partially under the control of the executive branch and it is entirely possible that the situation could arise where a majority of the Commission might be fundamentally opposed to the philosophy of the elected Congress and Executive. Now, this is not to imply that there should be allowed any opportunity to play politics with atomic energy. The American people expect that with a new administration there will be a new Secretary of State, with new principal advisers, and that the same pattern will be followed in other executive departments.
>
> Since the impact of the operations of the Atomic Energy Commission, both on domestic and foreign policy, in many ways exceeds that of other executive agencies which are directly responsive to the change of political administrations, there is no logical reason why the Atomic Energy Commission should be exempt from such political responsibility. The present arrangement, therefore, in my opinion, is not only bad political philosophy, but, as well, is poor administrative procedure.

Let me repeat that I thought we needed an independent, nonpolitical agency to handle the problems of atomic energy. If any agency of the Government should be nonpolitical, it is the Atomic Energy Commission. Yet, Mr. Campbell says that is bad political philosophy. He wrote the chairman of the joint committee only last year complaining that the Atomic Energy Commission is not sufficiently politically responsive. That is the man whose nomination is now before the Senate. He has been appointed to head the one and only agency which Congress has, the General Accounting Office. If he considers that the Atomic Energy Commission should be politically responsive, are we not warned that he might consider that the General Accounting Office should be politically responsive?

I read this letter to the Senate committee in the presence of Mr. Campbell. I listened to his succeeding testimony. He did not retract his philosophy. So far as the record stands, he still holds that it is bad political philosophy for the Atomic Energy Commission not to be politically responsive. Are we not thus warned?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is puzzling the Senator from North Dakota is this: If a man will take orders, as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, and enter into a contract because he is ordered to do so by the President of the United States, what assurance has this body that he will not act in a similar manner as Comptroller General?

Mr. GORE. I am unable to offer the Senator any assurance. I think we must be forewarned. I remind the Senator of my statement a moment ago, that the junior Senator from Tennessee read this letter to the Senate committee in the presence of Mr. Campbell, and he did not retract that philosophy.

At the close of the hearing the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], turned to Mr. Campbell and said:

> As far as I know, the hearing is concluded. All who may be interested have been given an opportunity to be heard. All Senators have been notified and given an opportunity to submit their views. Except for extending to Mr. Campbell the privilege of filing a statement if he wishes to do so—and I hope that will be limited to any response you want to make to whatever Senator GORE may have testified in this statement—the hearings are concluded.
>
> (Mr. Campbell notified the committee that he did not wish to submit any further statement.)

So, not only was opportunity accorded him then to say that he would not, in the position to which he has been nominated, apply the political philosophy which he holds, but he was invited to submit a statement later for printing in the hearings. He later notified the committee that he did not wish to make any further statement. Are we not thus warned, I ask the senior Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. This man is appointed to a position for 15 years. It strikes me that what the Congress wants is a man who is entirely independent of politics in every way. His job is to scrutinize the actions of the executive departments in dealing with public funds, so as to save the taxpayers every dollar possible. If a man in that position is to take orders from any President, Republican or Democrat, I should say that he is not the kind of man we want as Comptroller General. Does the Senator from Tennessee agree with me?

Mr. GORE. I agree entirely with the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. In fact, it might be advisable, when a Republican President is in office, to have a Democrat in the position of Comptroller General, and vice versa. Certainly there should be someone in that office as a watchdog, scrutinizing expenditures running into billions of dollars. Every once in a while we hear a story such as we heard a short time ago with respect to the Housing Administration—a story of crookedness and graft. If the Comptroller General is not on the job as a watchdog to look after the interests of the taxpayers of the country, who in heaven's name is there to do the job?

Mr. GORE. We have no one. This is the only agency which Congress has.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Tennessee says that the nominee stated that he would follow politics.

Mr. GORE. I do not know that he said he would follow politics, but I read what he said.

Mr. LANGER. Does it not mean that, when we analyze the statement?

Mr. GORE. He complained that the Atomic Energy Commission was not sufficiently responsive to the Executive politically.

Congress created the agency as a nonpolitical agency. The General Accounting Office was created for the sole purpose of serving as an agency of Congress, solely responsible to Congress, to

exercise surveillance over the vast sums which the Congress appropriates.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator whom Mr. Campbell is going to try to please in this very important position. Is he going to try to please the man who appointed him, or is he going to try to please the Congress? What is the answer to that question, based upon the record and upon what Mr. Campbell stated in his letter?

Mr. GORE. Of course, I cannot foretell how Mr. Campbell will perform the functions of this office if his nomination is confirmed. If it should be confirmed, I would earnestly hope that he would abandon his presently held political philosophy and execute the important duties of that office to the full satisfaction of the Congress. But I have no assurance which I can pass on to the Senator that such would be the case.

Mr. LANGER. Was not his appointment as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission confirmed?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Whom did he represent after he went on the Commission? Did he represent the people or the President, when the President said, "Sign that order"? How could a State government operate if the governor of the State could say to a board created to protect the interests of the taxpayers of the State of Tennessee, North Carolina, North Dakota, or any other State, "Sign this order, even though it may result in the loss of millions of dollars"?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the difficulty the Senator from North Dakota has is this: The President of the United States has the right to appoint an individual to an administrative position in one of the executive departments.

However, in this case, is it not true that Congress enacted a law establishing the General Accounting Office as a creature of Congress? That makes it entirely apart from an administrative position in the executive branch of the Government. Is that not the fact?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly what the Senator from North Dakota has been trying to tell the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. GORE. The confirmation of this nomination cannot and must not be treated as routine.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. It is not like the ordinary nomination to which the Senate gives its advice and consent. In this instance, in order to avoid constitutional difficulties and a possible infringement upon the prerogatives of the President, an understanding was developed and reached under which the head of the agency was to be identified with the legislative branch.

At no previous time during the history of the agency has an appointment been made from the executive branch of the Government. Lindsay Warren, to whom the Senator from North Dakota has referred, served with distinction for about 15 years in the House of Representatives. All his predecessors in the agency were men who had been identified with the legislative branch.

In the present instance the advice and consent must be literal, and the appointment must be made with the advice of the legislative branch. Only by the rejection of this nomination, which was made in contravention of the understanding to which I have referred, can Congress preserve its right to a voice in the selection of the head of the agency.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the executive branch of the Government. However, I do not like to see the legislative branch lose its power to pass judgment on a nomination, particularly when I am aware of the fact that so far as this nomination is concerned, it is not a Presidential appointment at all. The agency in this case was intended to be a watchdog for the legislative branch of the Government. I hope we will seriously consider what that means.

The people of North Dakota trusted the Senator from North Dakota. The people of Tennessee trusted my good friend, the Senator from Tennesese. The other Senators were trusted by their people. Are we now to surrender, not our rights—we do not say our rights—but are we now to surrender the power which in certain instances belongs to the legislative branch of the Government?

Are we going to let the appointment be a Presidential appointment? I do not have in mind a particular President. It could have been Roosevelt. It could have been Truman. It could have been Eisenhower. I am trying to protect the dignity of the United States Senate. Are we going to say that anyone may be appointed to this position? Are we going to confirm a purely executive nomination, or are we going to protect the dignity of the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from New Mexico, with the understanding that the Senator from Tennessee will not lose the floor?

Mr. GORE. With that understanding, I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico, who has had vast experience and long service in the Senate, whether it is not true that formerly there was a great deal of crookedness and corruption, and that when a Senator went home and his constituents came to see him and complained the Senator would have to say, "I am helpless. We passed a law, and the Executive carries it out."

As a result, Congress finally passed a law which created the position of Comptroller General. It was intended that the agency be an agency of Congress. It was supposed to be an agency on which Congress could rely. The head of the agency was supposed to scrutinize closely the acts of the various departments and independent agencies. Are we not now being asked to surrender the power of Congress over the agency by confirming this nominee?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point I am trying to make. I am trying to agree with the Senator from North Dakota. The agency was created by Congress. Congress wanted someone to check and scrutinize the activities and expenditures of the various Government departments and agencies. The General Accounting Office is not an Executive creation. The President of the United States did not send a message to Congress asking that the agency be created. Congress established the agency.

There have been some good administrators of that agency. Lindsay Warren, whose name has been mentioned, was one. There have been other good officials at the head of the agency. It was always understood that the General Accounting Office would be the congressional watchdogs so far as expenditures were concerned. That is what the agency was intended to be. Now, all of a sudden, we are faced with an Executive appointment, and we are asked to surrender our power.

We might as well not seek reelection in our States from now on, if we are to surrender the power over the purse strings. We might as well have only one branch of the Government, and make it all executive.

I still love my country. I still love the legislative and the executive and the judicial branches of the Government, with each of the branches performing its own functions. If that is not to be the case, we might just as well not continue to seek office in our home States.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished and able senior Senator from New Mexico. I hold that this nominee, on the one hand, lacks the essential qualifications for the position to which he has been nominated. On the other hand, he has demonstrated and expressed a political philosophy which disqualifies him. I have referred to that political philosophy.

I now wish to discuss his lack of essential qualifications for the position. In doing so I wish to say again that my position is entirely free from personal bias toward this gentleman. I have met him. He is an affable gentleman. He is a man of qualifications. He is a gentleman who might well be qualified for some other position in the Government. However, he lacks the qualifications essential for the position of Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Before the Senator passes on from the general political philosophy of the nominee I should like to invite attention to a part of his political philosophy and ask the Senator what he thinks of it.

We know that, in the past, the Comptroller General in his watchdog capacity, has suggested or has had a so-called blacklist, of certain corporations, and has undertaken to use his influence against them when they have conducted themselves in violation of law or in such manner as to make them incompetent to handle Government business, and to prevent them from handling it. There is

quite a substantial precedent for such action in the Office of the Comptroller General. A number of companies, while not actually law violators, have conducted themselves in an improper way, and the Comptroller General has undertaken to see that they shall not have Government business.

In the National Holding Company Act Congress tried to prevent holding companies from getting together for the purpose of removing local control over electric rates and to prevent the kind of a situation which arose under Insull in the days of the old Electric Bond & Share Co.

In connection with the Dixon-Yates contract, as the Senator knows better than does anyone else, there is a bringing together of holding companies in violation of the spirit if not of the letter of the National Holding Company Act. Yet this nominee not only condoned it but was an actual participant in it. I do not know that the Comptroller General is going to furnish the people and the Congress of the United States any protection from the onslaughts and the greed of certain big holding companies in endeavoring to get together again as they did before the passage of the act, and do things which are diametrically opposed to the intent of Congress as expressed in the holding company law. When the nominee himself is a participant in allowing such a situation I do not see how his can be the proper political philosophy to protect the interests of the people and to carry out the will of Congress.

I do not know whether the Senator intends to cover that subject matter.

Mr. GORE. I had not intended to cover it, because I have sought to base my position upon two most fundamental grounds: One, that this nominee lacks the essential qualifications for the position; and two, that in his brief time in office in another position he expressed views which specifically disqualify him for this specific office.

An examination of the biographic data submitted with his nomination indicates that he has had advancement in his chosen profession, for which I applaud him. But, Mr. President, in addition to the circumstances, facts, and history which I have recited, upon which alone this nomination must, in my opinion, be rejected, the very nature of Mr. Campbell's background and experience, in addition to his political views to which I have referred, causes me to question the advisability of confirming his nomination.

It is imperative that the committee and the Senate consider the nature of the functions which the General Accounting Office was created to perform and does perform. It is much more than a simple accounting or bookkeeping function. Former Representative Cook spoke with great foresight when, in 1920, he envisioned that this position would be "something more than a bookkeeper or accountant." How prophetically he spoke, Mr. President.

The function of the General Accounting Office is now far more than that. It involves the interpretation of law. The record is replete with references to the duty of the Comptroller General to pass upon the legality of expenditures. The function of the General Accounting Office is not so much to determine how much money is spent, but how it is spent. The value of the General Accounting Office to the Congress lies to a great extent in this field in order to assure that the money is spent in accordance with the intent of Congress.

Presumably, the Bureau of the Budget can be relied upon to make a tabulation of the amounts spent so as to prohibit expenditures in excess of the total amount of appropriated funds, but the Congress does not depend upon the Bureau of the Budget to advise it upon the legality of expenditures. It is upon the General Accounting Office that Congress relies for such surveillance.

I hope my remarks will not be construed as reflecting in any way upon the accounting profession or upon those who pursue it. Accountants have an important role to play in the operations of the General Accounting Office. But in the selection of an individual to head this agency, to direct its operations, to establish its policies, and to render its decisions, I believe experience and background of a legal or legislative nature are essential. Mr. Campbell is totally lacking in experience in either field or in identity with either field.

We do not find in the law any specific requirement that the Comptroller General must be a lawyer or that he must possess legal or legislative training and experience. Over the years, however, beginning with the passage of the Budget and Accounting Act, there has been developed a concept that the Comptroller General should be thoroughly familiar and identified with the legislative processes of the Government. Since the passage of the act there have been only three Comptrollers General. The first of these, who served from 1921 until 1936, was Mr. John Raymond McCarl, who had been, when appointed, secretary to Senator Norris, of Nebraska, and had succeeded at that time to the executive secretaryship of a committee. Mr. McCarl was succeeded by the Honorable Fred Herbert Brown, who had served 6 years as a Member of the Senate. Mr. Brown was, in turn, succeeded by the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, who for many years prior to his appointment, as I have said, was a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. It was my privilege, pleasure, and honor to serve with him. He was a distinguished Representative. He loved the legislative branch of the Government. He was loyal to it. He held its independence essential to the liberty of his country. As Comptroller General, he resisted efforts to make the General Accounting Office subservient to the executive branch. He defended the prerogatives and the power of the office which he held. He defended and upheld the responsibility of that office to Congress. His was a record of great service to his country and his fellow men.

As a result of the knowledge possessed by these men and their loyalty to the legislative procedures of Congress, and their appreciation of the value of preserving the checks and balances as between the legislative and the executive, the policies of the General Accounting Office and its direction have been such as to insure its performance of the role intended by Congress.

Members of the Senate who are now granting me the honor of an audience have themselves resisted demands to encroach upon the General Accounting Office. Yet, though we will resist efforts to bring that office under the power of the President in reorganization bills, though we will take legislative steps to insure that the General Accounting Office will be responsible to Congress, and Congress alone, we can lose this one agency of Congress by permitting the appointment of a person to head it who is not primarily loyal to the legislative branch of the Government. We can lose the last agency of Congress, the one and only agency which is solely responsible to Congress, merely by permitting or confirming the appointment of one who is primarily loyal to the executive branch; by confirming the nomination of one who has boldly asserted that even the Atomic Energy Commission should be politically responsive to the Chief Executive.

I speak not as a partisan in this respect. Because some Members are now present in the Chamber who were not present at the time I previously made this statement, I repeat that during Democratic administrations I have resisted efforts to encroach upon the responsibility of the General Accounting Office to the legislative branch alone. I would resist the confirmation of this nomination, I believe, no matter by whom the appointee might have been nominated, for he lacks the essential qualifications of the office, and he has asserted a political philosophy which is the very antithesis of the responsibility of the position to which he has been appointed, as it was envisioned in its creation.

I do not believe that the experience and qualifications of Mr. Campbell, distinguished though his career may be, have been such as to make him uniquely fitted for the position of Comptroller General. Indeed, they tend to disqualify rather than to qualify him. His record is devoid of experience calculated to steep him in the traditions of Congress and the urgency for its independence; devoid, too, of experience in the interpretation of legislative intent, and devoid of legal training and judicial review, as well.

Not only is the nominee without these essential qualifications, but he comes directly from the executive branch of the Government, thus violating another unwritten law with respect to the position of Comptroller General that has prevailed throughout more than 30 years.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that this nominee, against whom I raise not one word of personal criticism, against whom I have no personal enmity, is without the essential qualifications for the position; and that his nomination, under all the circumstances with which Members of the Senate are familiar, violates understandings which have surrounded this office since its creation in 1921.

The selection of Mr. Campbell, without the advice of the leaders of one or the other House of Congress, is an affront to Congress, and it will be only by the rejection of this nomination that Congress can preserve its right in the selection of the head of its own agency.

I summarize by emphasizing these points and ask the Senate not to confirm the nomination of Mr. Joseph Campbell to be Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the able exposition of views made by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I desire to associate myself with those views.

History shows that the office of Comptroller General was created to give the legislative branch of the Federal Government an officer to supervise the expenditure of appropriations by executive departments and agencies. History shows also that it has been customary to appoint to this office persons whose experience in Government has been with the legislative branch—an experience which would insure their discharge of the duties of this highly important office from a legislative rather than from an executive viewpoint.

When we depart from this tradition and confirm the appointment as Comptroller General of one who comes from the executive branch of the Government, I think we destroy a very praiseworthy and necessary tradition and destroy in large measure the value of the office. If it is desired to make the office of Comptroller General the important arm of the legislative branch of the Government which it was designed to be, we must insist that the occupant of the office shall be one whose experience in Government identifies him with the legislative branch of the Government, otherwise we shall be reducing ourselves to the rather absurd position of having the executive supervise the executive, which was foreign to the thinking of Congress when it created this great office.

For these reasons, I concur in what the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee has so ably said and announce that I expect to vote for the rejection of this nomination.

I do not question in any way the integrity of Mr. Campbell or his proficiency in his chosen profession as an accountant. I shall vote against the confirmation of his nomination, because of his lack of legislative experience, because of his lack of a legislative viewpoint, and because I do not believe that the office of Comptroller General can have the value it is designed to have to the Government if Congress, in effect, shall permit the executive branch of the Government to supervise itself.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator from North Carolina also think that the position of Comptroller General is of a quasi-judicial nature?

Mr. ERVIN. I do. The occupant of that office is called upon to pass on the legality of the expenditure of Federal moneys by the agencies and departments of the executive branch, and I do not see how a man can pass upon legal questions if he has had no training in the legal field. I know I have spent my life in the legal field, and I have found it most difficult to pass on many legal questions. I do not believe a man who has had no experience in such an activity is capable of doing so.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to thank deeply the senior Senator from North Carolina for his generous references to my efforts in this regard. I am grateful to him. Does not the Senator think that if the nomination should be confirmed a precedent would have been established which would destroy the traditions of 34 years with respect to the office of Comptroller General?

Mr. ERVIN. If the pending nomination should be confirmed, I think not only would the traditions of 34 years be destroyed, but that in a large measure the value of the office would be destroyed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in connection with the nomination of Mr. Campbell to be Comptroller General. I realize that those who oppose his appointment are sincere. I believe they are mistaken in their viewpoints, but I am quite sure they are sincere in their opposition. I consider it to be unfortunate that a man possessing, as Mr. Campbell does, the national stature, vast experience, proficiency in his business, and a broad-gage knowledge of public and semipublic financing, should be subjected to the attacks of which he has been the object and to the charge that he is unqualified for the position of Comptroller General.

I have not known Joseph Campbell long. The very first time I ever saw him in my lifetime was on the day he appeared before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with his nomination by the President to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. I had looked through his record somewhat prior to that time. I discussed his viewpoint with him. As a member of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I became convinced that in his profession as an accountant, he had had a unique and unusual experience in matters of public finance, not only the accounting end, but the administration end, and legality end, so to speak.

The nomination of Mr. Campbell to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a short term, which term would have expired on June 30 next, was confirmed by the Senate.

The record clearly shows that some time ago he felt that the Commission was not the most satisfactory place for him to serve, because of his experience and qualifications along other lines, and he thought it was fair that he resign at that time. As I have said, his term was to have expired on the 30th of June next, anyway. But during the year or so that he served on the Atomic Energy Commission I had considerable experience with him; and I say to you, Mr. President, that I have never come in contact with a man who created a finer impression of fundamental, basic honesty and decency, straightforwardness, and high competence, than did Joseph Campbell. He is a leader in his profession, which is that of accountancy, and of investments, mostly on behalf of educational and charitable institutions. He has had experience in interpreting law—if you please from a layman's standpoint—and of straightening out and keeping on the right track the finances of some large institutions, among them Columbia University.

I shall presently read a statement setting forth in part the experience which Mr. Campbell has had in the past; but before I do that, let me say, Mr. President, that I know of no man who is better qualified for the position in Government to which he has been nominated than is Joseph Campbell. I say that sincerely, because I believe he is uniquely and unusually well qualified for that office.

In his appearance before the Committee on Government Operations, when it was considering his nomination, he made a statement, which is incorporated in the committee report. He made that statement with respect to his background, his experience, and the things he has done. It is one of the most impressive records that a man nominated for a position can bring to a committee which is considering his appointment.

I hold no special brief for Mr. Campbell, except to testify to the high admiration which I have for him as a result of association with him and observation of his conduct.

But I say to the Senate, that if our Government wishes to have in public office qualified persons who can do the work assigned them with honesty, integrity, and ability, and can do it with the same vigor, honesty, and integrity with which they have discharged their responsibilities in private life, then Mr. Campbell ranks at the top of those who are available for public employment and public service.

Mr. Campbell has had an impressive experience. As I have said, I had no knowledge of him prior to his coming to Washington, other than perhaps to read his name in a newspaper, or something of that kind. But I desire to call attention to his experience: He is a veteran of World War I. His university education was financed entirely by scholarships which he won on his own merit. He early began in the accounting business and became assistant treasurer of the Columbia University Press. Later, he became assistant treasurer of the Columbia University Corp. For a number of years he was the director of the financial business and legal aspects of the war activities of Columbia University. I think one of the motivating reasons why he was asked to serve at least for a time on the Atomic Energy Commission was that he was the moving factor on the part of Columbia University in the negotiation of contracts for experimentation in the atomic field. In connection with those activities, he gained some knowledge of that field.

Mr. President, it will be found that over the years Mr. Campbell has had extensive experience in negotiating—on behalf of both Columbia University and others—contracts with the following Government agencies: The Air Force; in the Department of the Army, the Chemical Corps, the Corps of Engineers, the Medical Corps, the Ordnance Corps, the Quartermaster Corps, and the Signal Corps; the Atomic Energy Commission; the Bureau of Public Roads; the General Services Administration; the Civil Aeronautics Administration; the United States Coast Guard; the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; the Economic Cooperation Administration; the Office of Education; the Federal Housing Administration; the Federal Security Agency; the National Academy of Science; the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; the National Research Council; the National Science Foundation; in the Department of the Navy, the Bureau of Aeronautics, the Bureau of Personnel, the Bureau of Ships, the Bureau of Yards and Docks, the Navy Purchasing Office, the Office of Naval Research; also with the New Jersey State Highway Department; the United States Public Health Service; the Office of Scientific Research and Development; the Department of State; the State of New York; the Veterans' Administration; and the War Production Board.

Mr. President, where can another man with such extensive experience in governmental contract negotiations, which have been successfully conducted, be found today? Perhaps other such men can be found; but I submit that the list I have just read is one of the most impressive indications of experience in governmental contract-negotiation operations of any kind I have ever known, in the case of anyone who has been nominated to a position of service in the Government.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In reading the record, as set forth in the report, and also in listening to the Senator from Iowa refer to the outstanding record of Joseph Campbell, I cannot for the life of me understand why anyone would object to the confirmation of his nomination.

After having served in the educational field—which service has qualified him for a position requiring research and study—and also having served with so many governmental agencies, he certainly understands governmental operations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me correct a misunderstanding the Senator from Minnesota may have. I did not say the nominee had served in all those agencies. I said he had, in connection with his representation of Columbia University and others, negotiated contracts, and seen to their supervision and performance, in the case of various governmental agencies. I did not mean to give the idea that the nominee had served in the numerous governmental agencies I listed.

Mr. THYE. I may have stated poorly my thought in that connection. What I meant to say was that he has had an excellent insight into government, as a result of having served in those various capacities and as a result of coming into contact with Federal expenditures in his educational work.

Mr. President, after having read the report, I cannot understand why there would be any objection to the confirmation of the nomination.

Therefore, I have listened with great interest to the explanation given by the Senator from Iowa of the nominee's qualifications, and I have been interested in hearing the Senator from Iowa state why in his opinion the nominee is eminently qualified to serve in the capacity of Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, before going further, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the statement of Joseph Campbell, the nominee to be Comptroller General of the United States, beginning on page 2 of the hearing before the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, 84th Congress, 1st session, and continuing through to the bottom of page 7, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearings was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH CAMPBELL, NOMINEE TO BE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that each member of the committee has a copy of the statement which I am about to read.

My purpose in preparing this statement is to disclose to you all information bearing on my appointment and relating to my past activities, including the names of the individuals with whom I have been associated during most of my working life, and the kind of business and financial transactions in which I have been involved over the years. In other words, this statement is designed to meet some important questions to which you would expect me to have the answers.

Born in New York City on March 25, 1900, I attended its elementary public schools and Townsend Harris Hall. In the spring of 1917, because of the departure of my older brothers for military service, I deferred entering college, finding instead a job as a clerk with the American Fore insurance group of New York. In August 1918 I enlisted in the United States Army as a private; I later was an acting line sergeant, and in October 1918 I was designated to attend the Field Artillery Officers' Training School at Camp Zachary Taylor, Ky. En route to that assignment on Nomember 8, 1918, I was recalled when word was received that World War I was at an end.

Upon discharge from the Army in December 1918, I worked first on the liberty loan drive then in progress; and thereafter as a messenger, later as a clerk, in the private banking firm of William H. Goadby & Co., Manhattan, until September 1919 when I entered Columbia University.

My university education was financed entirely by scholarships and loans, supplemented by earnings from teaching school and private tutoring. My early college work included principally history, government, and economics, but later I devoted most of my time to statistics, accounting, auditing, business law, and income-tax courses. I received an A. B. degree in June 1924, having lost a year due to an injury and a resulting illness.

Immediately upon graduation, I started work as a junior in the accounting house of Lingley, Baird & Dixon, its principal office being in New York City. During this period I also was the assistant treasurer of the Columbia University Press, the publishing organization associated with Columbia University. In the fall of 1926 one of the firm's clients requested loan of my service, and I then began employment with Valentine & Co., paint and varnish manufacturers, as assistant controller. Subsequently I became controller of that organization and of its parent company, the Valspar Corp. In the spring of 1931 the interest which I represented withdrew from the management, and I returned to public accounting on a full-time basis with Richard T. Lingley & Co., successor to my former employer. In the spring of 1932 I became a general partner in the firm and continued as such until June 30, 1933, when I found myself with a large enough practice to establish my own organization.

Thereafter until April 30, 1941, I was engaged solely as a partner in the firm started in 1933. We had our share of routine audit and systems work, but the larger part of my own time was devoted to special examinations, investigations, and reorganizations.

In this connection I should state that I am a registered certified public accountant of New York State and of Connecticut, as well as a member of the American Institute of Accountants and of the New York and Connecticut State Societies of Certified Public Accountants.

In the spring of 1941 the trustees of Columbia University in the city of New York, for whom I had done considerable consulting work, asked me to become the assistant treasurer of that corporation, looking toward early succession to the treasurer then on point of retirement. One of their serious problems was the approaching changeover to an intensive war research, development, and training effort for the Government. I believed I had an obligation to respond to this call on my services. I sold my practice and started with the university on May 1, 1941.

From that date to the end of World War II, my principal activity at Columbia was the direction of the financial, business, and legal aspects of its war activities. At the same time, of course, I shared with the then treasurer responsibility for the management of the endowment consisting of real estate, mortgages, and securities and for such other matters as ordinarily fall within the purview of a university financial officer.

During World War II and thereafter until I entered the Government's service on July 27, 1953, I either personally negotiated or supervised the negotiation of all of the university's contracts with the United States Government, with the State of New York, and with the city of New York. In this connection, I should point out that these agreements were without financial profit to Columbia and were entered into at the request of the Federal or State or city authorities. During this period contracts with the Federal Government totaled over 800 with aggregate appropriations of approximately $85 million and total expenditures of about $73 million. The related work was carried on at over 30 different sites in this country and abroad by a staff of about 3,000. My own staff included principally accountants, lawyers, and auditors.

Our contracts covered the following Government offices: Air Force; Department of the Army—Chemical Corps, Corps of Engineers, Medical Corps, Ordnance Corps, Quartermaster Corps, Signal Corps; Atomic Energy Commission; Bureau of Public Roads; General Services Administration (now under Deparment of Commerce); Civil Aeronautics Administration; United States Coast Guard; Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; Economic Cooperation Administration (now Foreign Operations Administration); Office of Education; Federal Housing Administration; Federal Security Agency; National Academy of Sciences; National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; National Research Council; National Science Foundation; Department of the Navy—Bureau of Aeronautics, Bureau of Personnel, Bureau of Ships, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Purchasing Office, Office of Naval Research (formerly Office of Research and Inventions); New Jersey State Highway Department; United States Public Health Service; Office of Scientific Research and Development; Department of State; State of New York; Veterans' Administration; War Production Board.

In addition, the university performed under substantial subcontracts with industrial organizations in turn working for the Government.

Among these activities was, of course, the so-called atomic-bomb project initially under a contract with the Navy, then with the Office of Scientific Research and Development, then with the Manhattan Engineering District, and finally with the Atomic Energy Commission. Other important war activities were an extensive underwater sound research and development program, the operation of the Naval Midshipmen's School from which were graduated over 21,000 line officers, the Naval School of Military Government, and a substantial medical research effort concentrated almost entirely at the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center in New York City.

With the cessation of hostilities in 1945, the return to the normal educational function of the university required a reduction in Government research. To accomplish this, I, among others, advocated the transfer of the continuing major Manhattan Engineering District atomic energy research from Columbia to some associated group of interested eastern universities. I was named chairman of a committee to accomplish this end, and, as a result, the Brookhaven National Laboratory was established under the control of Associated Universities, Inc., of which I was the first treasurer.

On March 9, 1949, I was appointed treasurer of the trustees of Columbia University, and in June 1949 I became, in addition, vice president of the university.

All phases of the endowment management are the direct responsibility of the treasurer and include, among other things, all legal, maintenance, insurance, patent and accounting matters, and purchases and sales. During my active service at the Columbia University such purchases and sales of investments were approximately as follows:

In Government securities, $284 million; in all other kinds of securities, $110 million; in real estate, $19 million; in mortgages, $16 million.

In addition to my activities as university treasurer, my responsibility as vice president of the university included supervision of maintenance and construction relating to the university's academic plant, power system, athletic facilities and outlying laboratories, and the administration of nonacademic personnel matters, labor relations, purchasing, and, in general, of all affairs of a business and legal nature.

The names of the present trustees of Columbia are as follows: M. Hartley Dodge, Willard V. King, Albert W. Putnam, Thomas J. Watson, George E. Warren, Thomas I. Parkinson, John G. Jackson, George L. Harrison, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Adrian M. Massie, Frank D. Fackenthal, Walter D. Fletcher, Douglas M. Black, William S. Paley, Robert W. Watt, Maurice T. Moore, Dr. John J. H. Keating, the Reverend John Heuss, Jr., Vermont Hatch, Grayson Kirk, Felix E. Wormser, Thomas W. Chrystie, and Lester D. Egbert.

On December 8, 1941, I became a trustee of the Central Savings Bank of New York, a mutual institution with deposits of about $380 million and about 170,000 depositors.

The other trustees of the bank are James G. Blaine, Lucius D. Clay, Cleo F. Craig, Robert A. Drysdale, Eugene Hennigson, James L. Lee, John Lowry, James A. McLain, Ralph T. Reed, Frederick M. Schall, Otto Strippel, Herbert J. Stursberg, and Louis Watjen.

The bank's committee on investments, of which I have been a member with Mr. Blaine, Mr. Drysdale, and Mr. Lee, approved, during the period of my active service (June 8, 1942, to July 27, 1953) total Government bond purchases and sales amounting approximately to $1,400,000,000, and other bond transactions totaling about $52 million.

During the period January 11, 1943, to July 27, 1953, I served continuously with Mr. Lee, Mr. Lowry, and Mr. Stursberg as a member of the bank's committee on mortgages and real estate, when we approved the purchase of 542 FHA-insured mortgage loans for about $41 million; 1,381 VA-guaranteed mortgage loans for about $13,500,000; and other loans for approximately $61 million.

During most of my active service as a trustee, I was chairman of the bank's examining committee, supervising the annual audit of the institution's affairs as required by the State banking department.

On April 28, 1950, I was elected and continue as a trustee of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, a mutual insurance company with assets of $415 million, serving the staffs of approximately 650 colleges, universities, and other institutions, generally of an educational nature. The names of the other trustees of this organization are as follows: Roger Adams, H. M. Addinsell, James S. Alexander, Charles W. Cole, Ralph E. Himstead, Richard M. Hurd, John I. Kirkpatrick, Cloyd Laporte, R. McAllister Lloyd, Milton T. MacDonald, Norman A. M. MacKenzie, Joseph B. Maclean, James M. Nicely, Francis T. P. Plimpton, Earl B. Schwulst, Sumner H. Slichter, Earle S. Thompson, Franklin B. Tuttle, and Joseph H. Willits.

From April 28, 1950, until July 27, 1953, I was continuously a member of the association's committee on mortgages and real estate, the other regular members being Mr. Schwulst, Mr. Laporte, and Mr. Lloyd. Transactions approved during that period included the following investments; the amounts are approximate: FHA-insured loans, $63 million; VA-guaranteed loans, $9,500,000; conventional mortgages, $40 million; real estate, $5,600,000.

From time to time I was a member of other committees of this organization.

In addition to these two principal activities outside the university, I serve as a director—without committee assignment—of the American Re-Insurance Co. and the American Reserve Insurance Co. to which boards I was elected on January 28, 1942, and February 23, 1950, respectively. In the past I was a director of the Lincoln Building Corp. and the McComb Estate Corp. Otherwise my corporate connections have, or have had, to do with my Columbia office or family responsibilities.

At present I am acting as trustee of certain trusts as a result of personal relationships or in connection with my university work.

In public service, I am a life trustee of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., a member of the committee on education of the New York State Chamber of Commerce, a trustee of the Manhattanville Neighborhood Center, and of the House of the Holy Comforter, both of New York City, and for some years was the treasurer and a director of the Alumni Federation of Columbia University.

As a consultant to the Department of Defense, I was a member, during 1951 and 1952, of that Department's Committee on Contracts With Educational Institutions; and during 1952 and 1953, a member of its Commission on Hazardous Duty and Incentive Pays for the Armed Services. I was sworn in as a member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission on July 27, 1953, for an unexpired term ending June 30, 1955.

After a year with the Commission, I became convinced that my particular experience and abilities could be better applied to Columbia and the other activities to which I have referred. Accordingly, I advised the President that I wished to leave the Commission on or before November 30, 1954. He then asked me to accept my present post, subject to Senate confirmation. I took office as Comptroller General of the United States on December 14, 1954, by recess appointment.

In this connection I should like to draw your attention to the circumstances leading up to this appointment.

During the past summer I reached the conclusion that it would be best if I returned to private life as soon as possible—preferably by early fall. I did not have an opportunity to discuss this directly with the President until September 20 when I tendered my resignation as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. Whereupon the President asked that I consider the Comptroller General post. Since he had not previously intimated that this request would be made of me, it was not until September 30 that I was able to reach a decision and, on that day, I accepted.

In the few brief discussions I have had in this matter, prior to and since my appointment, neither the President nor any member of his staff has sought or has received my views, nor have they expressed to me their views, with respect to the Office of the Comptroller General or to the organization and operation of the General Accounting Office.

If I may, I wish now to give you this first expression of my concept of the place of the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office in our system of government

Anyone engaging in public accounting or in certain kinds of legal work must have a general understanding of the organization and methods of the General Accounting Office. This was my experience during the period from 1924 to 1941. Thereafter, when with Columbia, in devoting the greater part of my time to Government matters, it was even more essential for me to be informed of not only the day-to-day decisions of the Comptroller General, but also to understand the particular function of the General Accounting Office in contracting and operating arrangements.

As a result, I came to my present Office with a wholesome regard for its staff, its procedures, and its integrity. In my opinion, this agency of the Congress today commands the high respect of the business community and the confidence of the public.

During recent weeks I have been reviewing the history of the General Accounting Office and its relationship to the legislative and executive branches of the Government. While there undoubtedly are views to the contrary, I personally am clear in my own mind that in enacting the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, the Congress intended that this Office be the agent of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch of the Government. There has been considerable discussion on this point over the years by students of government; nevertheless, the Congress emphasized upon enactment of the Reorganization Acts of 1945 and 1949, and

again at the time of enactment of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, that the General Accounting Office is a part of the legislative branch. I believe that it is the only proper status for the Office, if it is, in fact, to be an independent agency of the Congress.

It cannot be under the control of, or responsible to, either the President or the executive branch. To be effective in discharging the functions imposed upon them by law, the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office must remain responsible to the Congress. At the same time, it must be recognized that the Office has a duty to cooperate with the executive branch to improve accounting, auditing, and financial reporting throughout the Government, as well as to work closely with the executive branch on other matters to improve economy and efficiency in Government operations.

The Comptroller General must be completely nonpartisan in his work. His reports to the Congress and others must be factual and fair. There must be a full disclosure of all matters, letting the chips fall where they may. It is the duty of the Comptroller General to enforce strictly the laws enacted by the Congress insofar as they relate to financial matters. If such enacted laws are either difficult of compliance from an administrative viewpoint or result in inequities, it is obviously the responsibility of the Congress to make whatever changes it may deem necessary. It, of course, is not within the power of the Comptroller General to modify a law by interpretation.

As the agent of the Congress, it is the responsibility of the Comptroller General, with the General Accounting Office, to render all possible service to the Congress and its committees in the form of reports and assistance. I understand this function was developed extensively during the past 10 years by my esteemed predecessor. It would be my intention to continue to emphasize and to develop this phase of the organization's function.

The CHAIRMAN. That concludes your prepared statement, Mr. Campbell?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the generous remarks of the able senior Senator from Iowa, in saying that he concedes that those of us who oppose confirmation of the nomination are sincere.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I know the Senator from Tennessee is sincere, although I happen to disagree with him. That, however, does not go to the question of the distinguished Senator's sincerity.

Mr. GORE. I was about to add that that remark is typical of the Senator from Iowa. He is always generous in conceding to his fellow Senators the sincerity of their views; he always takes that position. I appreciate it, and I wish to say that I enjoy working with the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

I, too, conceded, in the course of my remarks, that Mr. Campbell has had a distinguished career. For that, I applaud him. However, the experience he has had would not, I take it, qualify him—according to the view of the senior Senator from Iowa—for appointment to the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If I may answer the Senator from Tennessee, I shall not refer to any appointments of individuals at any time to the Supreme Court, but I will say that there are persons who have been proposed for appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States who I thought were not qualified; and from the standpoint of judgment, commonsense, and interpretative ability, I would say that Joe Campbell would be far better qualified to serve the country on the Supreme Court of the United States, even though he is not a lawyer, than would some persons who have been proposed, but have not been appointed to that Court. In that connection, I refer to no one who has been appointed to the Court.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. That may well be. I brought up that question only because I have previously said that there are positions in the Government with respect to which I would gladly support the nomination of Mr. Campbell; but there are positions in the Government for which I believe he lacks the essential qualifications.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding to me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I appreciate the Senator's view, and I respect his view. He is sincere. I am not attempting to do anything to detract from his position. As I stated a moment ago, frankly, I happen to disagree with him, but I think we can disagree without difficulty.

I wish to discuss for a moment the question of legal training. Much has been made of the fact that Mr. Campbell is not a trained lawyer, that he does not possess a law degree. However, I suggest that during the past 30 years his experience as an accountant and a layman qualifies him for this position. Today accountants appear before boards and bureaus of the Government in connection with delicate and technical legal matters. They are not admitted to the practice of law, as a rule, but they are acknowledged to possess the ability to deal with legal questions. They have a knowledge of the legal phases of their profession which entitles them to appear as advocates on behalf of clients before boards and bureaus of the Government.

When the criticism is made that Mr. Campbell is not a lawyer, I reply that the most momentous decisions in the world today are made by the President of the United States. They involve most serious and fundamental legal problems; and yet the President of the United States is not a lawyer and does not claim to be a lawyer. He is a man of judgment. He is a man capable of listening to advice from skilled technical and professional advisers, and acting upon the advice which he receives, but he is not a lawyer.

The Secretary of the Navy does not have to be a lawyer, but he must pass upon contracts. He takes the advice of the technically able counselors in his Department.

The number of contracts which the Atomic Energy Commission enters into each year runs into literally hundreds of thousands, yet no member of the Atomic Energy Commission at this time is a lawyer. Nor is it thought absolutely essential that any member be a lawyer. There are many scores, if not hundreds, of lawyers on the staff.

There are between 100 and 150 lawyers in the General Accounting Office. The Deputy Comptroller General is a lawyer. With between 100 and 150 lawyers in the agency, if the necessary technical and legal advice is not available to the Comptroller General, I do not know how it could be obtained.

Today there is no man living who could head one of the vast departments of Government and personally pass upon the legal problems which arise almost every minute. No one has the capacity to do it.

The heads of the great industries of this country, whose very business life depends upon the legality of the performance of their contracts, in many cases are not lawyers. It does not require a lawyer to be the head of a departmental agency. Every agency of the Government is involved every day in the interpretation and application of legal principles to the business of government. There are lawyers on the staffs of the various departments to advise the heads of those departments.

Let us get back to the Atomic Energy Commission. Probably there is no more vital scientific, technical, and production agency in Government today than the Atomic Energy Commission, with all its activities. Yet it does not require a man highly schooled in science, engineering, or anything else, to be a good Commissioner. I think it is well to recognize some of the various branches of our economy on that Commission, but it is not essential, because in the scientific field there is a general advisory committee, consisting of the top scientists of the country, to advise the Commission, which is a commission of laymen. The members of the Commission must make up their minds based upon good commonsense and sound judgment.

Today there is not an engineer on the Commission; and none is necessary. I would not object to a member of the Commission being an engineer if I thought he had commonsense as well as engineering training in the particular category. But it is not essential, because there are technical boards of engineers to give advice in that field.

So it is with the General Accounting Office. A man who knows finance, who knows the operations incident to the expenditure of public funds, needs only commonsense and a willingness to take advantage of the technical advice in fields in which he is not technically trained. In effect, our great universities are public bodies, so far as concerns their investments and their operations. A man who is familiar with such operations, and who has had broad experience with government, needs only commonsense to avail himself of the technical advice in fields with which he is not familiar.

If the Comptroller General undertakes to inspect procedures involving the expenditure of funds in the Navy Department, must he know navigation? Must he know how to operate a zonar set? Must he know how to fire electronically the big guns?

If he goes into the Air Force to inspect the application of public moneys appropriated to the Air Force, must he know how to fly a jet fighter? It seems to me that the fallacy of the argument, with all due respect to those who advance it, that because he does not happen to be a lawyer he is disqualified for this position, must be patent.

We need a man of consistent courage, ability, and honesty. Not a word of aspersion against the honesty or integrity of this man has been uttered on the floor, and I am quite sure that Senators who object to his nomination have no thought of impugning his integrity or honesty.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who spoke against the confirmation of this nomination, affirmatively reiterated that point; and he is sincere. It has been affirmatively admitted on the floor of the Senate by the opponents of Mr. Campbell's nomination that he is a man of great ability and experience.

We next come to the argument that he will not represent the interests of the Congress of the United States. Again I say that I do not wish to create the impression or leave the connotation that I believe that those who object to him on that ground are impugning his integrity, because I do not think they mean to do so. However, in effect, when the charge is made that Joseph Campbell, whose honor has not been impugned, and who, through every acquaintance he ever made, can produce testimony that his integrity is inviolate, if he assumes the obligations of this office will not discharge the duties of the office sincerely, honestly, and decently in the interest of the Congress, those who make the charge in fact, impugn his honor and integrity.

Again I say that I am utterly certain that those who use that argument have no intention whatsoever of attempting to create that impression. But that is the effect of it. They say, "Here is a man who is admittedly honest now but if he assumes the responsibilities and obligations of public service, he will not discharge them honestly and in contemplation of law."

If that is not an imputation against the honor and integrity of an individual, who otherwise has never had his honor and integrity impugned, then I do not know what it is.

I cannot repeat too often that I do not believe the argument is used for that purpose at all. However, it has that implication. That is the interpretation that could be put on such a statement.

Let us now consider the argument that this is an Executive appointment. The law itself prescribes how the Comptroller General shall be nominated and appointed. The law says that the President shall appoint the Comptroller General, with the advice and consent of the Senate. That is, technically, the President nominates the Comptroller General, and the Senate advises and consents to his appointment, as in other cases of Executive appointments.

Therefore, the statute passed by Congress provides that the President shall nominate the Comptroller General and appoint him by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Has there been any deviation from that practice in this instance?

The argument is made that Congress should have something to say about it initially. There is nothing in the law that so provides. What mechanism has been created whereby Congress can name the Comptroller General? None whatever.

Is it to be argued that a couple of leaders on each side of the aisle in the Senate shall get together and name the Comptroller General and the President shall appoint the person they agree upon? I do not happen to be in that leadership. However, I have something to say about such an appointment, as does every other Member on both sides of the aisle.

The Librarian of Congress is supposed to be a servant of Congress. Yet the law provides that he shall be nominated by the President of the United States.

These questions have been discussed and the same arguments have been advanced heretofore, but they have always been discarded as unworkable and impracticable. Are we to have a caucus in the Senate of Repulbican Members and a caucus of Democratic Members? Are we to have a caucus in the House of Representatives of the Republican Representatives and a caucus of the Democratic Representatives?

Are we to run teams of candidates for these offices? Are we to select candidates whom the President shall appoint? I think not. I believe no one will argue for that kind of procedure or contend that that should be done.

The responsibility for nominations rests with the President. The responsibility for advising and consenting rests with the Senate. Thereafter the President may appoint.

Certainly the Comptroller General is a servant and agent of the Congress and of the interests of the public in seeing to it that public moneys are properly expended.

I wish to suggest that the questions which have been raised with reference to the Comptroller General are not new questions. The question of providing proper safeguards for the administration of public funds is not something which has come into existence during the past 20 or 30 years. It goes back to the 12th or 13th century. Quite a history of it has been compiled by the Chief of Investigations of the General Accounting Office.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an address entitled "The Power of the Purse," delivered by Mr. W. L. Ellis, Chief of Investigations of the General Accounting Office, at the Hillsdale (Mich.) College annual alumni dinner in 1954. It is a succinct and very lucid discussion of the historic background and development of what we now call the comptroller system of public finance in our Government and in the government of England.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER OF THE PURSE

(Speech by W. L. Ellis, Chief of Investigations of the U. S. General Accounting Office, at the Hillsdale (Mich.) College annual alumni dinner, 1954)

When we speak of the power of the purse, we mean the control by Congress on the amount and purposes of the spending of the public's money. It is our doctrine that this is Congress' first business, the one real power upon which all other legislative work depends for its effectiveness—the one which most directly benefits you as a citizen and a taxpayer if it is used well, and most severely hurts everyone if it is used badly. In fact, the view is held that the control of public funds historically is the basic reason we have a representative legislature as an inherent institution of a free government.

The function we are talking about did not spring full-blown from the mind of the lawgiver. It became settled only after centuries of internecine conflict, some of it very bitter indeed. Our system being modeled very closely after the English system, with which the framers were familiar, let us refer for a moment to what it was.

Through the centuries of the Middle Ages no problem arose on what could or should be done with the sovereign revenue, with perhaps 1 or 2 untypical exceptions. The first form of English appropriation is understood to have been authorized in 1348 for the defense against the Scots, and in 1353 for the furtherance of the border wars then in progress. Again, when Henry IV was asked to render accounts of the extraordinary supply voted him for military use, his answer was, "Kings do not render accounts." But these efforts were the exceptions; and the reason is this: There was no treasury apart from the King's own purse. His ordinary expenses of government were paid from the revenues of his private lands and feudal rights. When further and extraordinary aids were voted him by the barons, and later by Parliament, they became the King's funds, subject only to the royal prerogative. It is true that certain reference can be found in Magna Carta to the already felt doctrine that taxation without common consent is illegal, a doctrine restated in the Petition of Right in 1628, and finally affirmed in the Bill of Rights later in that same century.

But parliamentary control of the spending of the royal revenue, as distinguished from raising it, is the story of the 17th century—the years of revolution in the mother country. Under the Tudor kings, Parliament hardly dared to meddle with such matters, but the stronger Parliament of 1624 set a precedent in an appropriation for extraordinary supplies that the money should be paid not to the King or to the Chancellor of the Exchequer but into the hands of commissioners named by the Parliament. This happened again in 1641 and during the interregnum it became an easy and comfortable adjustment to have the national finances managed by a parliamentary committee. Five years later, when a very large sum was needed for the Dutch war, a clause inserted in the bill called for the money to be spent only for the purposes of that war. After the revolution of 1689 and with the great powers dedicated to Parliament by the declaration of rights and the bill of rights, a simple insertion in the law, limiting the money voted to the purpose for which appropriated, became the custom and then the rule. Under the same influence came the new limit on the size of the standing army, and the statute necessary to furnish it with funds and provisions was carefully limited to an annual vote, good for 1 year only. Per-

haps that background is why it is said: "In fact, most scholars are now agreed that, although the knights and the burgesses could be useful to the King in acting as his agents and giving occasional advice on matters of importance to local government, the Crown's need of money was the most immediate reason for summoning representatives of the counties and towns to Parliament."

In brief, what called Parliament together from time to time at the King's writ was his need for money; what Parliament did to make its voice effective was to enact a control not merely on the raising of money but on its spending.

With that background, it is not surprising that the English colonists in the New World, in their colonial assemblies, used effectively the power of the purse in their struggle for power with the royal governors. A writer named Charles Bullock says:

"Nothing stands out with greater distinctness than the persistence and success with which the colonists insisted upon the right of their legislative assemblies to direct their finances. This side of colonial history is so familiar that we can assume the facts of the separation of powers and the establishment of legislative control of the finances."

I think also that background explains why the basic provision in the Constitution on this subject was adopted with so little controversy. I could not find it even mentioned in the Federalist papers. What the Constitution says, very simply, is this: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

Now, to give force to this generality, Congress, over a hundred years ago, supplemented the Constitution by a series of statutes providing:

First. All money received from any source for the use of the Government must be deposited into the Treasury.

Second. Once appropriated by the Congress, the public funds may be used only for the purposes for which appropriated.

Third. Except in the case of supplies for the soldiers, no contract may be made to bind the Treasury unless—according to the neat language of that time—it is under "an appropriation adequate to its fulfillment."

Fourth. No Department may expend more than the amount appropriated for the current year.

To carry out the system of controls so provided, the primary machinery, of course, is the President's budgetary program and the annual Congressional review and passage of the money bills. The latter responsibility falls almost entirely upon a most hardworking and effective branch of the Congress, namely, the Appropriations Committees. Their hearings are continuous, long, and arduous. Their staple diet is the book of estimates, a mass of tedious figures. Their work is quite without glamor—their meetings without publicity. It is not for them to receive acclaim by raising estimates and granting benevolences. Rather, theirs is the unpopular task to cut down, to deny, to withdraw, to refuse—sometimes at great political risk—the enormous pressures of the interested groups, and most of all the spending department, whose plea it is that the pillars of the Republic will fall if their budget is cut.

The great change in recent years in the appropriation process is the shift from specific detailed appropriations of relatively small amounts to broadly worded provision of general funds in large amounts, often hundreds of millions of dollars, for a single purpose—such as projects for rural rehabilitation, loans for public works, and the like. This leaves to the President and the departments much of the policy on how the money is to be spent and for what. In turn, this calls for a great improvement in another legislative function, namely, the oversight or surveillance of administration. This may happen through committee hearings and investigations, through appropriation cuts the following year, and finally through our own work in the General Accounting Office, which is a part of the legislative branch and exists—in short terms—to try to see that the Government's fiscal business gets run right.

The first of these methods of congressional surveillance is the investigation process of the Congress itself or its committees. That story is a long one, and you will be relieved to hear that it must await another occasion. But it may be of interest to remind you that the earliest congressional investigation, in 1792, related to the spending of public money in this area (Michigan) and it examined into the military expedition of General St. Clair into the Northwest Territory, and into charges of waste, mismanagement, and failure.

The Government's accounting office has been in business since 1789 but under different names and always subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury until 1921. During those years, what can be described as "a paper audit" was thought to be enough; that is, an examination of the papers and vouchers submitted to justify the expenditure of funds, on the presumption that the vouchers truly stated the facts. No deficiencies were felt in that form of check-up.

In the great budgetary reform of 1921 which resulted from a study set up by President Taft, and from the hard lessons of the war years, the accounting office was removed from the executive branch, put under a new officer, the Comptroller General of the United States, who though named by the President is subject to dismissal only by joint resolution of the Congress and whose work is not subject to the direction of any other officer. Accounting and auditing activities, further strengthened by the act of 1950, are directed ultimately toward (a) assisting departments and agencies in meeting their express responsibilities for the establishment of appropriate and meaningful accounting systems and (b) comprehensive analyses of agency operations to determine the extent to which accounting and related financial reporting provide the needs of both Congress and management and an effective control over Government assets.

For the first time, too, the act of 1921 tells us to investigate, at the seat of Government or elsewhere, all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds. We are told to dig out the facts. When an investigation is required, our Office of Investigations is called in. We have a small staff located at 30 different points in this country and 3 points in Europe; and we have a few investigators covering the Far East on travel assignment.

The subject matters investigated are limited only by the broad generality of the language quoted above. For example, they may cover allegations of wasteful and extravagant procedures and expenditures; departmental activities not authorized by the law; failure to collect sums due the Government or the use of collections without authority; fraudulent or otherwise irregular purchases; excess spending for property and equipment; manifest overstaffing; unauthorized facilities; unnecessary, ineffective, or overlapping activities; undercharges for services supplied and sold; dissipation of property through neglect; unjustified allowances granted; or any other erroneous condition reflecting inattention to the public interest. We may examine into the purpose for which money was spent or the method by which it was used, and specific findings in one area may lead to widespread investigation of similar matters in other areas and agencies.

The results of this work are sent in the form of reports to the departments whose job it is to do something about them and, when necessary or requested, the reports may be sent to the Congress or the committees, where they very frequently form the basis of congressional hearings. Some few specific examples are briefed in the Comptroller General's annual report to Congress, such as our reports on PMA grain warehouse losses and defalcations, veterans' training under the GI bill, extravagant construction of housing for foreign service employees in Germany, dual staffing in military and civilian positions, year-end procurement to obligate available funds, and timber sale practices in the national forests and public lands.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am interested in the statement of the distinguished Senator from Ohio with regard to this nomination and with reference to the fact that the General Accounting Office is an agent of the legislative branch of the Government. I was interested, in that connection, to read the statement Mr. Campbell made on that point to the committee:

> While there undoubtedly are views to the contrary, I personally am clear in my own mind that in enacting the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, the Congress intended that this office be the agent of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

It seems to me that statement clarifies the situation. It makes it clear that Mr. Campbell feels the position is not a part of the executive or any other branch of the Government, except the legislative branch.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I had no intention to discuss this subject at such great length. I shall conclude my remarks by referring to the suggestion made this afternoon that Mr. Campbell has had no experience in the administration of the legislative interests of the Government.

Let me say that if that argument were valid, then no human being in the United States could run for the United States Senate for the first time, because he would have had no previous experience in the Senate.

No lawyer, regardless of how successful he might be in the practice of law, could be placed on the bench of his State or on the Federal bench, if he had never been a judge, because he would have had no experience as a judge.

In public office 2 or 3 requirements are essential. One is the realization that a public office is a public trust. In keeping with that realization, another requirement is an inviolate integrity on the part of the incumbent. I would consider a most desirable and essential requirement, ability. If I had to differentiate among these qualifications, I would probably put ability third, because, in my opinion, the realization that a public office is a public trust and the inviolate integrity of an individual are the fundamental essentials. We can usually find the ability that goes along with those two qualifications.

In this case I am convinced, from association with this man, that he has a full realization that a public office

is a public trust and that he knows that the Comptroller General is a servant of the Congress whose duty it is to assure the proper application of the funds which the representatives of the people vote for their Government. I am also convinced that Mr. Campbell is a man of the highest integrity, because not only has no one questioned it, but the record is replete with testimony as to his integrity. Furthermore, his ability and experience cannot be questioned.

Mr. President, I regret that there are some who sincerely and genuinely feel they must object to this appointment. I thoroughly disagree that they have any grounds upon which to object, either on the basis of integrity or ability or a realization on the nominee's part that the position of Comptroller General is primarily one of service to the Congress in supervising the application of the funds appropriated by the Congress. I feel it is an appointment worthy of the high requirements of the office. Probably in connection with no appointment or very few is there unanimity of opinion. Some people may honestly in their own minds disagree. In this case I consider that the appointment is one of which the Congress will eventually be proud—that of a man who will serve in the highest traditions of the Office and will discharge the duties of the Office with high integrity, great ability, and a deep sense of responsibility.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long in speaking with reference to this appointment. But I wish to emphasize 2 or 3 points because of my close experience with the Comptroller General's office.

Before I became a Member of this body I was a member of the other body for 14 years, and during that time I served on the House Committee on Government Operations. During that time on three occasions, I was chairman of a subcommittee which worked very closely with the office of the Comptroller General. No one had greater respect for the immediate predecessor of Mr. Campbell than did I. Lindsay Warren was indeed a fine man who endeavored to do, and did do, a good job.

The question of politics was brought up in the discussion by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee and in the colloquy which took place between him and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

Mr. Campbell may have made rather remotely some mention of politics in a letter.

There have been only three Comptrollers General before Mr. Campbell. The first was J. Raymond McCarl. Among the things listed in Mr. McCarl's biography is the fact that he was executive secretary of the National Republican Congressional Committee. So, obviously, he had some political contact, and he was formerly private secretary to the late great Senator George Norris.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will permit me, I am aware of the statement referred to a while ago to the effect that Mr. Campbell said there should be political responsibility to the President on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission. I am familiar with that statement. I think I understand its connotation. I believe he meant that this is a political government, not a Republican or a Democratic government, and that the responsibility for a political government in its administration must necessarily from time to time head up with the chief executive officer of the Government, who is the President, and that an administrative department should have, in the broadest sense of the word, political responsibility, that it should not be an agency running all over the map on projects of its own, but should be coordinated with the administrative program and administrative accomplishments. I think it was in the broadest possible sense that Mr. Campbell used the word "political."

Mr. BENDER. I am very grateful to the Senator for his comment and for emphasizing what was in Mr. Campbell's mind when he wrote the letter to which reference has been made.

I wish to say, further, that the second Comptroller General, Fred Herbert Brown, was a Presidential elector on the Democratic ticket of Wilson and Marshall. So, obviously, he was versed in the ways of politics.

I know his predecessor, Mr. McCarl, was an active partisan. Mr. McCarl was a Republican and Mr. Brown was a Democrat.

Mr. Lindsay Warren had vast political experience. He was a delegate to the Democratic national conventions in 1932 and 1940. He was chairman of the State conventions in 1930 and 1934, and was temporary chairman and keynoter——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator refer to national conventions?

Mr. BENDER. State conventions in his home State of North Carolina. These men were active in their own parties, but that did not influence one iota their service in the important position of Comptroller General. Lindsay Warren did an excellent job, even though he was an active Democrat and an active partisan. He performed his duties extremely well, although in a few instances he made some mistakes. In the 80th Congress I was chairman of a committee which investigated the Comptroller General's office. I am sure Lindsay Warren would be the first to agree with my statement that in the General Accounting Office things were going on which were not altogether businesslike. The committee was not a headline-hunting committee. It was a committee which had in its membership the now majority leader of the House of Representatives, JOHN MCCORMACK, and several other eminent Representatives. We discussed the accounting methods of the Comptroller General's Office and brought about many reforms in that Office.

So even so good a man as was Lindsay Warren made some mistakes during his tenure of office.

It has been emphasized that the Comptroller General's Office is an agency of the Congress. It is. The Comptroller General is directly responsible to the Congress. But the fact that the nominee is a businessman and a certified public accountant should not militate against him, particularly when it is recognized that accounting has much to do with the position to which he has been appointed.

The fact that he was confirmed by this body to serve on the Atomic Energy Commission, which is highly important so far as the national welfare is concerned, certainly should not militate against him.

No one questions his integrity; no one questions any aspect of his official work as a servant of Columbia University or of his contacts with the Federal Government and Federal agencies. The office of Comptroller General requires a man who has had business experience. If a nominee for this office had been a delegate to a Democratic or a Republican convention it certainly should not militate against him. But that is not true in this case. Mr. Campbell, so far as I know, has not been active politically. In fact, that is one thing I hold against him. I like people who are active in politics.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. He has been much less of a politician than have his predecessors; is not that correct?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. He has not mixed in politics at all until he received this appointment.

Mr. BENDER. That is my impression.

Mr. LANGER. Which may be a very good thing.

Mr. BENDER. I think so. It may be an advantage not to have been active in any political organization, since he will occupy a position as the watchdog of the Treasury for the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. In examining the proceedings held before the Committee on Government Operations, I was impressed by the fact that Columbia University is one of the largest universities in the world.

Mr. BENDER. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LANGER. My recollection is that Columbia owns some of the very finest property in New York City, property which occupies 4 or 5 blocks. Rockefeller Center, I believe, is located on some of the property of Columbia University.

Mr. BENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. It probably receives revenue amounting to millions of dollars annually.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate the observation of my good friend from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Certainly a few years ago it was the largest university in the United States.

Mr. BENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Ohio know of any time when there was

any scandal connected with the administrative or financial affairs of Columbia University, with which Mr. Campbell was connected?

Mr. BENDER. Having been a member of the Committee on Government Operations, which passed upon Mr. Campbell's qualifications, I can say there is nothing in his record, private, official, or in any other way, which indicates that he is anything but an honorable gentleman, who is highly qualified to perform this very important service for the United States Congress and the taxpayers.

Mr. LANGER. Moreover, Mr. Campbell is a certified public accountant, is he not?

Mr. BENDER. He is a certified public accountant, which certainly should not militate against him in the consideration by the Senate of his nomination.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. To be qualified to serve as Comptroller General, one would need to be a certified public accountant just as much as he would need to be a good administrator, would he not?

Mr. BENDER. The Senator is 100 percent correct.

Mr. THYE. In order that the Comptroller General may be enabled to understand the field of investigational work in connection with the appropriation and expenditure of public funds he must be a certified public accountant. If he has that qualification, the legal aspects of the position can be studied and acquired later.

I think the person whose nomination is before the Senate for confirmation, Mr. Joseph Campbell, has the qualifications which can assure Congress that he is eminently fitted to examine and determine whether funds which have been authorized and appropriated by Congress have been properly expended.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate the observation of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota. I have no quarrel with lawyers. I think the Government and the Senate need lawyers.

Mr. LANGER. The Senate needs farmers, too.

Mr. BENDER. The membership of the Senate comprises good farmers, good lawyers, and good businessmen.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that for many years Columbia University has conducted a course in business administration in its School of Business.

Mr. BENDER. I may say to my good friend from North Dakota that Columbia University has one of the outstanding business schools in the world.

Mr. LANGER. It is my understanding, further, that there have been thousands of graduates from the Columbia University School of Business.

Mr. BENDER. That is true; and they comprise many persons who now occupy some of the outstanding positions in Government and the business world.

Mr. LANGER. My understanding, further, is that the Columbia University School of Business is closely allied with the Harvard University School of Business.

Mr. BENDER. That is exactly correct; there has been a very close relationship between the two schools for many decades.

Mr. LANGER. It is further my understanding that the board of trustees of Columbia University is comprised of persons of outstanding business experience.

Mr. BENDER. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LANGER. So when the university was searching for an assiistant treasurer, the trustees of Columbia, most of whom, I assume, were residents of New York, and had had an opportunity to observe the thousands upon thousands of graduates of their business school, were able to select from among those persons one who would make a good assistant treasurer, and they selected Mr. Campbell.

Mr. BENDER. I am certain that the observation made by the Senator from North Dakota is entirely in order, and I appreciate his contribution.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, when he was appointed assistant treasurer, it was with the understanding that his predecessor planned to resign in a short time and that Mr. Campbell would succeed him as treasurer.

Mr. BENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. When that time came, the board of trustees, who are businessmen, and had the advantage of being intimately acquainted with thousands upon thousands of other good businessmen, did not even select one of the graduates of the Columbia University School of Business; instead, they picked Mr. Campbell because of his very outstanding record as a business administrator.

Mr. BENDER. There is no question about his ability. As a matter of fact, I believe the President of the United States could not have selected, from anywhere in the country, a person better qualified and equipped for this particular position.

As I have said, while I was a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, I had close contact with the Office of the Comptroller General. I know something about the operations of the Office and of the qualifications which are necessary for a person to head that Office and to do a good job.

I feel certain that Members of Congress in both Houses will be proud of the decision which I hope the Senate will make today to confirm the nomination of Joseph Campbell.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BENDER. I have finished.

Mr. LANGER. I would not concede for a moment that Mr. Campbell is the best person who could have been selected for the position because I know there are many other persons, in Maine, North Dakota, Ohio, and other States, who could fulfill the requirements of the office of Comptroller General. I would not say that Mr. Campbell is the best person who could have been nominated, but certainly, based on the record, it seems that he is an outstanding man—one who will do a very good job.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate sincerely the contribution of the Senator from North Dakota.

I hope and trust that the Senate will act immediately to confirm the nomination, and I hope that even my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] will leave the mourners' bench and join with us in doing this good work.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I intend to speak for only a very few minutes, and I do so because the question has been raised as to the qualifications of Joseph Campbell, whose nomination for the office of Comptroller General is under consideration by this body.

If we were to undertake to follow the criterion suggested by one of the speakers today as the basis upon which the office of Comptroller General should be filled, then we would bar from that office three Members of this body, I can think of at the moment, who probably possess the greatest knowledge concerning the interpretation of appropriation acts and the manner in which the moneys of the Government should be expended so as to express the will of the Congress. I refer to three Senators who are not lawyers, and who would not qualify in that respect. One of them is my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Another is the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Another is the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. All three of them have played very important parts in handling matters before the Appropriations Committee. Yet they are neither accountants nor lawyers.

Mr. President, my reason for speaking, briefly, is that I think I do have some knowledge of the qualifications needed for the particular office under discussion. It so happens that I have been privileged to serve in a similar capacity—on a smaller scale, I will admit, but in a very similar capacity—and I, too, am not a lawyer, and do not possess that title behind my name. But I am an accountant, and I recognize the great value that an accountant can bring to the office of Comptroller General.

I may say that if, during many years of the past, the Members of this body and the Members of the House of Representatives had paid a little more heed to the urgings of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] with respect to financial accounting and other monetary problems which have confronted the Nation, we would be in far better shape, from a fiscal standpoint, than we are today.

I may say that if Mr. Campbell could make no other contribution than to go into the office of Comptroller General, admirably qualified as he is, and make a comprehensive study and evaluation of the accounting systems which are presently in use at the Federal level, and submit to Congress specific recommendations which would pinpoint the loopholes that currently exist—and we are not getting factual reporting and accounting of value to the Congress in determining the needs of the administration in carrying out its program—then he would be making in that field alone a very great contribution toward putting

the fiscal house of the Federal Government in order. When fiscal reports are made we should be able to have confidence that they are actual, factual, and sound.

I am referring especially to the manner in which unobligated balances of appropriations are reported. There is no uniform or systematic way of making such reports. One department reports such balances on one basis. Another department—say the Defense Department—reports them on another basis. We can go down the line and find that the departments give figures today which in 2 weeks will be out of balance by millions of dollars.

No, Mr. President, we are not getting the type of fiscal reporting and accounting the country needs in order properly to evaluate and carry out a performance program in keeping with the budget which is sent to the Congress.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I take it the distinguished Senator may have referred to the remarks I made, in which I set forth what I consider should be the qualifications of the Comptroller General.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator is correct. I was referring to the Senator's comment that he did not believe Mr. Campbell was qualified because the office under consideration is quasi-judicial in character, and therefore one filling that office should be an attorney in order to be able properly to interpret the meaning of the appropriation bills passed by the Congress.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the remarks the distinguished Senator has made. I wish to say I regard him as one of the fine, able, and conscientious Members of the United States Senate. However, I should like to remind him that I used the following words in my remarks:

> I believe that experience and background of a legal or legislative nature are essential.

Under those terms, the distinguished Members of this body to whom the able Senator referred would not be disqualified. I only undertook to point out that the nominee lacked experience either in the legislative or the judicial branches of the Government, or training in the legal field.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me say to my good friend the junior Senator from Tennessee that I appreciate fully the statement he made in that regard. Let me say further, because of the knowledge I believe I possess of this particular type of work and the kind of experience needed in such a position, that unless a person were exceptionally well grounded in the field of accounting and the practices that go with it, he would not be able to do what I have suggested should be done; namely, make recommendations concerning the action which should be taken both by the executive and the legislative branches of the Government to put into effect a uniform, effectual, and accurate system of accounting which would reflect true balances at all times, nor would he be able to report to the Congress whether or not appropriations were being expended in keeping with the intent of Congress and in accordance with the history back of such appropriations.

Today we are not getting such reports, and Congress will never get them until there shall be established a unified system of accounting for the Government in all branches, so all departments will report and account for their money in the same manner. Otherwise, it is a loose-knit proposition. I can assure my colleague that no business or State government that is well organized and operated could possibly exist under the type of accounting system under which the Federal Government operates.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In my opinion, there is great merit in the statement which the distinguished Senator from Maine has just made. His statement, however, does not go to the essential qualifications of the office of Comptroller General. True, it would be well and good for the Comptroller General to have accounting experience, but I do not believe that qualification is as essential as are the other attributes which should be possessed by an incumbent of the office.

I wish to call to the able Senator's attention, with apologies for interrupting his able address, the Fifth Intermediate Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, 81st Congress. I read from that report:

> The Comptroller General not only must decide questions which arise in connection with the carrying out of the duties of the General Accounting Office. He also is required, at the request of a disbursing or certifying officer or head of a department or establishment, to render a decision in advance of the legality of any proposed expenditure. The decision is binding on the General Accounting Office and on the officer or agency. Decisions of this kind are extremely important. They decide not only the propriety of individual payments but, often, the legality of entire programs. The Comptroller General makes certain that spending programs and financial transactions conform to the intent of the Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, if I may say so—and I shall not go into the matter at any length—I think the Senator from Tennessee and I could better talk over this matter at some other time, because it would involve a long discussion. To the proposition what he has just mentioned I would seriously object; and I think any person who understands the fundamental principle would object to it also. I refer to having the Comptroller General under the structure established by the Congress act as a preaudit officer, on the one hand, and then, on the other hand, turn around and, as a postaudit officer, act on what he has previously given consent to. That is completely outside all the true concepts of the practice of accounting and auditing. One serves as a preaudit officer. The other serves as a postaudit officer. The Comptroller General is the postaudit officer of the United States Government, acting for the Congress, and he determines whether expenditures have been made in accordance with the laws enacted by Congress.

The suggestion advanced would involve a long discussion. I shall be happy to discuss it at length with my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee, at any time he may desire.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. PAYNE. I am very happy to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. GORE. Again, Mr. President, I think there is considerable merit in the position the able Senator from Maine has taken. However, I submit that the matter I read illustrates the necessity of the Comptroller General having more than auditing experience or capacity.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will permit me to interrupt for a moment, let me ask whether he has ever known a business corporation to employ a firm of lawyers to do auditing work as postauditors in determining whether the instructions of its board of directors have been faithfully and accurately carried out by the officers of the corporation. Or has the able Senator ever known a State to take similar action? In such cases, whom do they employ? They employ a firm of certified public accountants, trained and qualified by experience to do that type of work. I can assure my distinguished colleague that I speak from knowledge, because I have served in that capacity.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield further to me?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; I am very glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I am aware of that business practice, and I think it would be good for the Government. In fact, independent audits have been used by the Government.

But the case the Senator from Maine cited was that of a congressional committee which inquired of the Comptroller General about the legality of a proposed program.

I should like to point out to the able Senator from Maine that only last week, I, as chairman of the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, was directed by the committee to invite the present Acting Comptroller General to come before the committee and give it his opinion as to the legality of the proposed highway legislation, now pending before the committee.

Mr. PAYNE. But he was not giving the committee an opinion upon a program which already has been placed in law.

Mr. GORE. No. By direction of the committee, I addressed to the Acting Comptroller General a letter—not having any bearing on the question of the confirmation of this nomination, I hope the Senator from Maine will believe—inviting him to come before the committee and give it his opinion as to the legality and feasibility of Senate bill 1160.

Just how the Acting Comptroller General can give such an opinion, I do not know. Perhaps he can, with the advice

of his counsel, pass on to the committee the composite of their opinions. But there may come a time when there is a disagreement between the legal counsel and the Comptroller General; and the law places upon the Comptroller General the responsibility for decision.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, after the law has taken effect, because I think my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee, will agree that if we were not to proceed along that line, every bill or any bill which was before this body would then become the subject of appeal by us to the Supreme Court of the United States, with the request that the Court give us its opinion as to whether the bill we were considering, if enacted, would be good or bad, or could be carried out. In other words, that principle can be carried both ways.

If we wish to find out about proposed laws, let us see whether it will be appropriate to take each and every measure to the Supreme Court of the United States, to obtain its opinion. In the final analysis, the Court will be the tribunal which will interpret the law, and pass judgment on whether it is or is not constitutional.

The Comptroller General passes on the execution of the law, to determine whether the executive and administrative branches of the Government have properly carried out their responsibilities and have made their expenditures in keeping with the intent of the Congress in the enactment of the law.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Maine will concede, I take it, that Congress does need an agency upon whose advice it can depend as being independent of any ulterior motive—to advise it as to the legality of pending legislation.

Mr. PAYNE. That is true; and there is nothing wrong with having the Comptroller General give the Congress his advice, when requested to do so, as to his version of what the law may mean. But he will give it only about a measure which has not yet become a law. It is only after it becomes a law that he takes positive position for or against an action which occurs under the law.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield further, let me say I am enjoying this discussion, but I realize the Senator from Maine does not wish to prolong it. So I desire to act in accordance with his wish.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished majority leader, too, would like to be able to finish as soon as possible.

Mr. GORE. He keeps turning a weather eye upon me, as well as upon the Senator from Maine. So at this time I shall desist. I thank the able Senator from Maine for his indulgence.

Mr. PAYNE. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I close by saying that I feel that in the person of Joseph Campbell we have a man who is admirably well qualified for the position of Comptroller General of the United States, and who, if his nomination is confirmed, will make a real contribution to the operations of that office.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE FEDERAL SECURITY PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY HARRY P. CAIN

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California desire to have the Senator from Minnesota yield to him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, Mr. President; I merely had in mind suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall be brief, and I do not believe it necessary to have a quorum call at this time.

Mr. President, I rise to bring to the attention of the Senate an outstanding address made this morning by the Honorable Harry P. Cain, former Member of this body, and a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. I ask unanimous consent to have the address entitled "Strong in Their Pride and Free," delivered before the seventh annual conference on civil liberties, in Washington, D. C., printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to direct the specific attention of the Senate to Senator Cain's comments with regard to the desirability of establishing a commission to study and make recommendations on the Government's security program. After an eloquent plea reaffirming the unique value and indispensability of preserving the letter and the spirit of the Bill of Rights in practice as well as word, Senator Cain made the following dramatic summary:

> What I have just recited about the letter of the Bill of Rights means just this: Had you chosen recently between being indicted for a capital or infamous crime or being held to be a loyalty or security risk, there would have been no choice to make. From the indictment, you would have been found guilty or acquitted; sentenced or released through language and methods everyone can understand. From the allegation that you were a loyalty or security risk, you might have long wallowed in the wilderness of despair and mental torment without determining what the charges were all about, or where they came from. Please note my use of the tense. Future consequences from recent refinements in the Federal employees security program remain to be seen.

Our former colleague continues:

> Above the pillars of the home in which the Supreme Court resides are these words: "Equal justice under law." There are few exceptions to this rule. We recently have been looking for without finding this sought-after inscription on other public buildings in your Nation's Capital: "Equal justice under government." The absence of this duality is the crux of the dilemma which plagues us. We have grown somehow to consider legal justice to be one thing and administrative justice to be a different sort of thing. Until justice is understood to be indivisible, this Republic of ours will be mired in troubles and beset by problems which defy solutions to be trusted.

These comments are very disturbing, Mr. President. They are not disturbing because they are uttered; they are disturbing rather because they needed to be expressed. It is a privilege for me to commend Senator Cain for his courage in speaking out so clearly, so intelligently and so eloquently. It is likewise a privilege for me to note that Senator Cain looks upon the creation of a commission to study the security program as a partial but a necessary step toward the solution of the problems he raises.

I now read former Senator Cain's comments with regard to the commission:

> Does the Government have an adequate answer to the expressed concern by the people that our systems of internal security are growing to be more powerful than the Government? Like you, I wish I knew. It has been suggested that the President appoint, with approval from the Congress, a commission of outstanding citizens to concern itself basically with policy questions relating to internal security. Without sidetracking this proposal with finality, the administration has thought that the Internal Security Section within the Justice Department can reappraise and advocate refinements and policy changes which the future may require.
>
> I think it possible that the Justice Department could do the job but I feel most strongly that a commission would have the better chance of being more effective, persuasive, and helpful to the Nation.
>
> In matters concerning aggression from the outside and the readiness and strength of our military posture at home, the President has available to him advice from the National Security Council. This instrument doesn't represent the views of a single department of the Government. It reflects the consolidated and weighted views of the Government. When this Council speaks, the Nation believes that it is getting a balanced estimate of a given situation.
>
> When it comes to important questions relating to internal security, the President receives his advice from several departments, but these views, as I understand channels of authority, are not necessarily coordinated nor do they always address themselves to the problem as a whole.
>
> When the Attorney General talks about internal security, he almost invariably makes reference to the Federal employment security program. When the President talks with you about the same subject, he may be addressing himself to the Federal employees program or to the security plan in the Armed Forces or the industrial-security program which is administered by the several services within the Defense Department, or to the Atomic Energy Commission's security procedures or to the International Organization Employee Loyalty program.
>
> Certainly the improvements recently adopted for the Federal employees program are not required to be accepted by the other programs.
>
> If an ambition is to achieve uniform and consistent standards and procedures throughout the Federal structure, I can think of no sounder way to approach the problem than through a detached and distinguished nonpartisan commission of some sort.
>
> I think the President would feel better if the recommendations from such a commission were available to him and I know that the Congress and the public would derive a better understanding of what is going on and what should take place in the future.
>
> We do not suffer from any lack of the persons wholly qualified to sit on a commission. Had I the happy assignment of making selections, there would be room for any former President of our Republic. I would look for the experience possessed by retired members of our higher courts. Some exceedingly splendid minds are ready to be used

from within both parties in each House of the Congress. Other national leaders in private life, both men and women, would surely respond to the challenge with energetic alacrity. There would be no problem in staffing a commission to the entire and grateful satisfaction of the Nation.

We often think it a pity that former leaders and builders in one field or another are put out to pasture when they have so much left to offer for the common good. Any among these could be employed for the benefit of everybody.

I am thrilled by the possibility that such a commission may, in due time, be agreed to and established. If our Nation didn't then have every ounce of confidence in the pronouncements to be anticipated, then we shall have lost our capacity for confidence.

Should a commission be authorized, the name of which might be the National Internal Security Council, then our President or those who follow him would be more fully prepared to master the uncertainties of our tomorrows. He or they could listen and consider advice which would accelerate our Nation's strength in all possible fashions.

A simple announcement that a commission is to be established would signify that the marriage between security and politics had been annulled. The cheering to take place all over this land would be heard throughout the world.

He continues:

In utter sincerity, I do maintain that political consideration in security questions has been the major source of our discontent and diminishing confidence in authority since the close of World War II.

There is no reason to say that one political party has been more responsible for this mischief than the other. Under circumstances which prevailed, each party sought to claim the credit for knowing more about security and freedom than the other. National campaigns have revolved around who was going to do what to whom in these fields. There has been no agency within the several administrations and few individuals who have been considered to be disinterested and objectively minded. The charge and countercharge are the weapons employed by partisan minds everywhere. One party is maligned for having attempted too little and the other party is criticized for having attempted too much. Republican and Democratic Party supporters mostly restricted their views to what their articulate spokesmen say. The independent voter picks and chooses from competing headlines.

A commission would have a far better chance of having its judgments considered on their merits. Much of what is good today is disregarded, held suspect, or neglected because it is written off as being politically inspired. The commission could stop most of this. It would, I think, place the greater emphasis on what rather than who is right and best for the Nation in the complicated equations which are the ingredients in the realm of internal security.

It is that spirit, Mr. President, that motivated the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and myself to introduce Senate Joint Resolution 21 to establish a Commission on Government Security. It is that spirit and those objectives that have been basic to the hearings on our resolution, which ended today, and in which I had the honor of sitting as chairman. These were hearings held by the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. Cain has well stated the case for the Commission. We welcome his support as a further indication of the growing bipartisan conviction that a resolution such as ours must be adopted if we are to protect the integrity of our security system and the integrity of our society as a democratic nation.

The hearings we have just completed, Mr. President, have persuaded me anew as to the desirability and necessity for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 21. Senator Cain's address of this morning will go far toward helping the Congress arrive at this decision in a nonpolitical spirit—not in the spirit of partisanship, but in the spirit of a common desire to strengthen our security program and our democratic institutions.

There is much more to Senator Cain's speech that deserves serious study and consideration by our Government. I am sure that my colleagues know that this is the second of a series of important speeches by former Senator Cain, of Washington, on this very important subject. It is my hope that Members of Congress will read his speech, which I have asked to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I have said that, for all practical purposes, we have concluded the hearings before the subcommittee of which I am privileged to be the acting chairman. It is entirely probable, however, in view of what I consider to be evasiveness, vagueness, and adroitness on the part of 1 or 2 Government witnesses in ducking certain issues, that I may ask for further testimony.

I am sorry to inform the Senate that one of the witnesses, namely, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, did not cooperate with the subcommittee to the extent I felt the subcommittee was entitled to cooperation. The hearings were not held in a spirit of vindictiveness or accusation. They were held in a friendly and warm atmosphere. They were held in a spirit of trying to analyze and bring forth information about the structure and purpose of the internal security program.

Many of the witnesses who appeared before the committee, particularly witnesses from the Department of Defense, from the Atomic Energy Commission, and from the State Department, tried very earnestly to be helpful, and they gave the committee a considerable amount of information, frankly and fully, much of it in prepared testimony, and some of it in cross-examination.

There are still some questions that need to be answered before the subcommittee, particularly with reference to what the review by the Civil Service Commission of preceding security programs offers in terms of suggestions, what deficiencies were found, what inadequacies, if any, were found, and what constructive proposals the Civil Service Commission under its authority can make to the National Security Council.

I regret to say that that information was not given to us. I regret to say also that even elementary statistical evidence which was needed by the subcommittee was not forthcoming. I now, as acting chairman of the subcommittee, serve warning that I shall insist upon that information being given to the responsible Members of the Senate who are charged with the inquiry into the delicate subject of internal security. In the main our hearings have been constructive, and I believe they have been highly informative. It is fair to say that as a result of the hearings we have been able to obtain at least a picture or an image of the so-called structural apparatus of the security program of our Government.

I would be less than candid if I said I was pleased with the picture. In fact, it appears to me that instead of there being one picture, there are many pictures. The situation appears to be more like a mural, with the many separate parts clearly delineated and describing different activities and procedures of the Government.

EXHIBIT A

STRONG IN THEIR PRIDE AND FREE

Mr. Chairman and my fellow citizens, your invitation does me honor and my firm hope in return is to add a little to your knowledge while expressing the fullest measure of my respect and encouragement for your endeavors, past, present, and future.

PART I. THE PAST AS PROLOG

On this day a year ago, the Attorney General of the United States was eloquent, persuasive, and action-advocating when he said to you:

"It is un-American not to be interested in the protection and extension of civil rights."

In further support of this exciting contention, the Attorney General added:

"The need for frank discussion and widespread dissemination of the issues regarding basic freedoms is imperative. The distinguishing feature of our Republic is that it was born of a struggle to secure these rights."

Here we have expressions of our Government's leadership at its finest. This is the character of official talk we citizens praise on hearing. In furtherence of this urging, we can offer details of our thinking in confidence that our petitions will be soberly and painstakingly evaluated and considered. That is all that any responsible citizen can or wants to ask.

If I am pointedly critical of some present-day internal security developments and programs, it should not be inferred that I seek to hinder or embarrass the President, the administration, or the Congress in any fashion. As a member of the administration, my function, with your help, is to strive for action which makes certain that the early-day struggle to secure civil rights will be continued to strengthen and maintain those civil rights. For the office of the President, my respect, like yours, is profound. For the person of the President, my own admiration and affection are keen and sincere. Let no person believe that I have any other ambition than to serve my country through stating what I believe to be true and employable for the common good.

Before getting at the present and reflecting on the future, let us dig into the developments, troubles, and progress of the past.

Unless one has lived along the banks of mighty rivers like the Mississippi or Columbia, it must be exceedingly difficult to appreciate the anxiety of flood fighters who struggle to save lives and property against the coming of the crest of the danger, or the depth of their relief and gratefulness when the peak waters begin to recede. These fighters know then that their work has really just begun but they instinctively comprehend, because of the past, that the battle for survival won't be lost, and that the goal of a less precarious and more reliable future will be achieved.

Most of my life has been spent near these rivers which possess an almost unlimited capacity for good and evil. When harnessed, they open up new and broader opportunities for development and progress. When they take off on a rampage after having overrun

their restraining walls and levees, they cripple and cut back the efforts of builders to move forward. Lessons about our country can be learned by watching a river as it builds or destroys.

The United States is analogous to the mightiest of all rivers, or as an understatement to a combination of the Columbia, Mississippi, Ohio, Missouri, and Colorado, with the strongest of all protective restraining walls and levees. The waters represent the Nation's power to be employed for good or evil; the levees and banks represent the people's potential for discipline, control, moderation, and direction.

The contest of our lives has always been a constant, difficult, and demanding effort to make our national strength serve our peoples' will in ways productive, constructive, just, and lasting. Out of this combat comes greatness and contentment, or futility and ruin. We have benefited and suffered from all of these through the years.

I say without thought of being contradicted that in recent years our Nation's river, driven by the winds and fury of fear, inexperience, suspicion, distortion, and intolerance has overwhelmed and washed away some, but by no means all, of the protective banks which had been constructed out of historical commonsense, reason, and justice.

My reference obviously is to our newly established internal security systems through which an understandable but unwarranted overemphasis on security has treated with far too many Americans as though they were faceless, prideless, and nameless; as though they were spineless, devoid of character, and lacking in that deep sense of devotion to our Republic which stimulates you and me.

But there is good news to be found in the misery. I state with considered conviction that the unruly flood which has threatened to make the essence of civil liberties unrecognizable in America has reached the crest of its most explosive danger and the waters of persecution unintended have slowly started to recede. I do believe that this very real flood menace can now be so managed and disciplined that we shall perhaps and reasonably soon, though not without major mental surgery, hard work, and a more alert citizenry, reconstruct and then maintain an internal security program which will assist in keeping us safe, self-respecting and free.

It has been reassuring to watch the Government and the Congress attempt more in the field of thought, reappraisal and intended procedural changes during the past 2 months than was undertaken in the previous 20 months. I think this is an accurate statement of fact. Certainly it gives promise of a healthier climate to come.

Those among us who are so situated as to acquire some perspective in matters dealing with security and the freedoms have been appalled, but not made cynical or skeptical about the future or entirely surprised, by the lack of balance, poise and understanding which has prevailed lately in high and important places, both public and private.

The peoples' liberties have been generally, in one way or another, temporarily in jeopardy during or after every domestic conflict or external war in which our Nation has been engaged. At intervals between the wars, minorities, many of whom subseqently were noted for their respectability, suffered severely at the hands of majorities and the Government. Need I more than mention some names: Abolitionists, Copperheads, southerners, Mormons, Masons, Catholics, Jews, Irish, Negroes, Germans, union organizers, "scabs," pacifists, teachers, feminists, Japanese, Indians, Chinese. This list could be extended too easily from the memory of any wide-awake and informed citizen.

During the First World War citizens were prosecuted and persecuted as obstructionists who advocated change or engaged in political criticism of those in authority. People could and did go to jail for expressing views held to be contrary to those supported by the Government even when these views were anything but dangerous to the public safety. Many who simply advanced ideas which were unpopular with the majority suffered as though guilty of the most serious crimes.

I wish that every student and thinking adult would give particular attention to the variety of ways and different eras in which Americans have been unfair and ruthless in their treatment of each other. This knowledge would make it easier to understand today's plight and point up the direction to be taken to undo the harm while making repetitions of abuses less likely.

Little has happened to us in this postwar period, shortly to recognize or celebrate its 10th anniversary, that hasn't happened to us before but there are differences we ought to think about.

In every other American period, the problem of disregarding or violating the other person's rights has been of concern only to us here at home. We had no fear or thought of danger from beyond our borders. We had ample time to reunify our people as a solid front to confront any foreign trouble which might be brewing.

Those were the good old days which have gone forever. In those days, we were required to be prepared to fight on foreign soil only part of the time. Now we must remain prepared to fight there or resist and repel aggression here—all of the time.

Our mission as a people and as a government is to so work and stand together in peacetime that we shall want to stand and fight together should there come another wartime.

I think that you here are to be in the vanguard of those who bring about this unity and singleness of our Nation's purpose in either peace or war. If you do not remain as the advance guard in this campaign, then our Nation is headed for disasters of undefinable dimensions. You are the people. The destiny of our Republic is for you to mold. The future will be what we, the people, really want it to become. This is easier said than done but the opportunity remains available.

In another stimulating passage, offered only 52 weeks ago, the Attorney General told you this:

"Our future is secure—for Americans believe above all in the dignity of man. They will never permit the substitution of intolerance and persecution for our cherished heritage: civil liberties."

What does this language really mean? What justifies the language? In what ways should it be applied to our daily lives? Are we using it on only half of an American double standard of justice which appears to be growing? Is the phrase "the dignity of man" esentially an oratorical prop or is it the workable and distinguishing feature between any American and the subjects of lands in which autocracy reigns supreme? Is the American individual actually deserving of any consideration for his dignity if he is thought to be, let us say, a present-day loyalty or security risk?

From this point on, I shall try my level best to offer answers to these related questions which are rational, reasonable, and historically correct.

As a federation of like minds in many organizations, you are joined in labors to preserve those civil liberties without which no human being can long remain free or unoppressed by some government.

If we speak the same language, we agree that what we mean by civil liberties is fundamentally included within the strength and the promise not just of the letter but also the spirit of the first 10 amendments to our Nation's Constitution. Live by those commandments, and no individual can be made a slave by his Government. Repudiate those commandments, and any government can enslave any people. Don't take my word to be the fact. The bloodshed and turmoil of the ages provide proof which is unassailable.

We Americans aren't what we have become through the years by mere chance. We remain different from most other peoples because the climate for our growth and development has been different from theirs. They have mostly looked to government for their success and health. We have mostly employed government to supplement what we have initiated and accomplished as men and women who have been free to join, to promote, to speak, to change, to believe in God or to be an agnostic or atheist, to move about, to venture, to become wise, to be a fool, to save, and to be ourselves.

It was intended from our beginning as a nation that our Government would guide and direct the national effort to be strong and secure, while every law-abiding citizen would be unmolested and unoppressed by that Government in his house, his person, his mind, his tongue, and his movements.

The dignity of man we are talking about only has a meaning with substance if it incorporates all of these features.

Those who established and were the first public managers of our Republic were singular scholars, historians, and patriots. They had a respect for government, but they knew better than to trust government. They had a respect for people, including themselves, but they knew better than to trust human nature. They were keenly aware that unrestricted government equals tyranny and that unrestricted liberty equals anarchy. They joined hands and hearts in a premeditated effort to establish a society in which there was a balance between a disciplined government and a people who might have liberty without resorting to license. In this attempt, their success exceeded the dreams and aspirations of the centuries which went before.

Those who were to launch America's Ship of State restricted their chances of running aground or off course even before they entered the pilothouse. These were the men who knew that the unratified Constitution before them would become just another future tyrant's scrap of paper unless it was joined by what became the Bill of Rights, your guaranty of a continuing opportunity to walk erect with head high as a free and independent human being.

In hope that they will someday be more widely read and digested, I make reference to a handful of classics which gave direction to our ancestors as they began to carve a different sort of nation from new and unlimited frontiers: The Magna Carta (1215); the Statutes of Westminster (1275); the Petition of Right (1628); Maryland's Toleration Act (1649); the Charter of Rhode Island (1662); Bushell's case (trial by jury, 1670); the Habeas Corpus Act (1679); the Toleration Act (1689); the Zenger case (1734); James Otis' the Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved (1764); Samual Adams' The Declaration of the Rights of Man (1772); the Declaration of Rights and Liberties (1774) issued by the First Continental Congress; Paine's Common Sense (1776); the Early State Bill of Rights of Maryland (1776), New York (1777), and Massachusetts (1780); and Virginia's Statute of Religious Freedom (1785).

All of these expressions were steps forward on the road to protecting the liberties of peoples against their own governments and individuals against the tyranny of majorities.

Then came 1791 and the Bill of Rights, without which there would be no Federal Constitution as we know it.

The Bill of Rights offers no protection to which any individual is not entitled. You can't find within its provisions any snug harbor of safety or comfort for the murderer, robber, rapist, libeler, kidnaper, or

traitor. Taken as a whole, they only demand that those who make charges must prove those charges to be true. Without this restraint, how many men and women might be executed and condemned on denouncements which evaporate when closely examined?

When some in authority refer to fifth amendment Communists, I shudder because of the lack of understanding and power for destructive evil which is inherent in those statements. One who refuses to testify against himself may be a Communist but there are solid and proper reasons why he may not be. There was once a one-eyed man in this country (George Spencer, of New Haven, 1642) who perished on the scaffold because in the agony of his inquisitional trial by a group of pious and well-intentioned citizens, he pleaded guilty to the charge of having sired a one-eyed monster by a sow belonging to a neighbor. Can you think of better justification for an amendment which requires the accusers to prove their allegations without help from the tongue of the defendant, witness or victim?

Those who use fifth amendment as an adjective of disapprobation modifying the noun "Communist" are as guilty of disrespect for the Constitution as any Communist could be.

Centuries of inquisitional tortures, mental and physical, and misgivings over man's inhumanity to man forged and tempered the bulwark of freedom that the individual shall not be required to convict himself. We should be less concerned by the few who hide behind the privilege without justification and much more concerned by those who trifle with and prostitute its significance.

Where would our Nation be right now if we couldn't assemble peaceably, or petition the authorities about our grievances, or pray as we like, or speak freely by word of mouth or in the press? For these blessings, we thank the first amendment.

What might our feeling be if we were denied the right to protect ourselves and if the authorities, civilian or military, could requisition our homes in peacetime or ferret through them in looking for things some gossip said might be there? I salute the second, third, and fourth amendments.

If it were not for the sixth amendment, we could rot in jail while waiting for a trial to be conducted by some petty tyrant who might, through whim, eventually inform us of the nature and cause of the accusation. Without this amendment, those who alleged against us would remain undisclosed and we could whistle without response for witnesses to speak out in our favor. Because of the amendment, we get a speedy and public trial; a bill of particulars; legal assistance when required and help in securing witnesses to support our contentions.

Because of the seventh amendment, we are entitled to a trial by jury even where the value in civil controversy is no more than $20.

If we are thought to be connected with some capital or other infamous crime, the fifth amendment requires our indictment by a grand jury and once acquitted, we shall not again be harassed or tried for the same offense. Once we have reestablished our good reputation, we can keep it.

I was fortunate to have been born an American because only in my beloved country does the law so clearly control the irresponsibility, prejudice, and venom which a considerable number of people, including authorities, possess.

Without the Bill of Rights, no American would be certain of possessing any personality of his own. We would be only what our rulers, masters, or judges wanted to think of us as being. The Bill of Rights was intended to provide every citizen with a name and a face of his own. A nation possessed of citizens without faces or names is a mass of anonymity but it can't be a republic.

In other periods, we have abused the meaning of the Bill of Rights. We are so abusing some of its meaning today. This must not dishearten us because until the amendments have been repealed, and this prospect is not in sight, nor is it likely to be, men and women possessed of reason can prevail upon others to understand that the amendments constitute our American way of life and with courage these same citizens can prevail upon authorities to live in accordance with every one of them.

What I have just recited about the letter of the Bill of Rights means just this: Had you chosen recently between being indicted for a capital or infamous crime or being held to be a loyalty or security risk, there would have been no choice to make. From the indictment, you would have been found guilty or acquitted; sentenced or released through language and methods everyone can understand. From the allegation that you were a loyalty or security risk, you might have long wallowed in the wilderness of despair and mental torment without determining what the charges were all about, or where they came from. Please note my use of the tense. Future consequences from recent refinements in the Federal employees security program remain to be seen.

Please permit me to assume that you do not think I like to make these distinctions. I do so because the fact, which can be too easily documented, is demanding of a broader public circulation.

Above the pillars of the home in which the Supreme Court resides are these words: "Equal justice under law." There are few exceptions to this rule. We recently have been looking for without finding this sought after inscription on other public buildings in your Nation's Capital: "Equal justice under government." The absence of this duality is the crux of the dilemma which plagues us. We have grown somehow to consider legal justice to be one thing and administrative justice to be a different sort of thing. Until justice is understood to be indivisible, this Republic of ours will be mired in troubles and beset by problems which defy solutions to be trusted.

In time, we must agree to reaffirm our faith in a Government by law or renounce that advocacy, which gave us liberty, in favor of supporting a government of men, which has given tyranny to others. The Constitution is no bar to such a change if we Americans want to make it. The question is ours to answer.

As for me, I pray that all of us will come to realize that justice is indivisible, and that every citizen will again believe that he will be as fairly treated under the administrative procedures of his national government, as by the Federal courts of his land. Then, prevailing misunderstandings, distrust, and troubles will disappear as does the fog before the illuminating rays of the sun.

Let us hurry that day.

PART II. SECURITY IN THE ATOMIC AGE

Are you clear in your minds as to where our Nation is headed? I am not. Do you believe that our political leaders know where we are going? I think not. Those who are the most informed can only make calculated guesses. Any estimate of the situation remains largely uncertain because of foreign factors over which the United States has small control.

We probably agree, in whole or in part, that the Communist campaign for the mastery of the world has been joined. We are trying to be stronger than our enemies in hope that they will not attack us and to make it possible for us to defeat them if they do.

In this moment of history which is neither peace nor war, we strive for a better world while preparing to destroy a large part of it if existing differences are not resolved at international council tables.

If the power of the universe is to be employed for peaceful pursuits, heaven on earth is actually in prospect; if this force is to be employed to maim, mangle and dismantle, hell on earth shall be realized for civilization must then return to the Dark Ages where there is little light, heat, food, shelter, progress, or satisfactions to be exchanged among the survivors from what we characterize as being the enlightened second or last half of the 20th century.

Winston Churchill said the other day, "imagination stands appalled" by the destructiveness of the hydrogen bomb. He thought, in hoping for the best, it might ironically come about that "safety will be the sturdy child of terror; and survival the twin brother of annihilation."

Like some of you, I am aware that an army division today has 80 percent more fire power than in World War II, and that a single B–17 can wreak as much damage as did the entire Air Force in that many years' war. Atomic cannon and guided missiles have long since left the drafting boards.

As I puzzle and worry over the gigantically contradictory alternatives which face America and mankind, I keep returning to the aspirations which have made us what we are. The best hope I personally have for the future comes from these determinations and progress in our everlasting fight to improve our stature as individuals.

If the world of the present comes tumbling down, as it has the power now for so doing, those who remain alive must begin to build another home for the living from the ruins. The only possible tools to be in our hands in the beginning will be our courage and self-respect, and a hoped for mutual trust among Americans.

In preparing ourselves for either peace or war, we must recognize that these ingredients are indispensable. We can't win any war or long maintain any peace unless we possess all three in abundance.

This personal conviction came to me during World War II when I was privileged to serve with the airborne foot soldiers whom the Germans called those devils in baggy pants.

There was little material difference between us and the well-trained, disciplined, and equipped German soldier. But in the final analysis, there was the difference in spirit which made the big difference in result. The German's government treated him as a number; ours respected us as individuals. Because of this difference, the German couldn't win World War II and we couldn't lose it.

The American's greatest strength was not in his weapons but in what most of them, especially those who died, were convinced was true. At least, the airborne soldier, whom I knew intimately, was powered and motivated by more than the guns and grenades he carried.

They would quietly say before taking off for the unknown anywhere:

"If it be life that waits, then I shall live
forever, unconquered.
If it be death, then I shall die at last,
strong in my pride and free."

If this motivation is not to be America's salvation and main reliance against the hazards of tomorrow, then I have profaned your time in being your guest and what I wish to suggest in the next few minutes will be valueless.

Unless we remain enthusiastic about being Americans; unless we have confidence in our Government, we aren't likely to see any universal peace established and we aren't going to win any war which may engage us.

If this be so, we ought to reexamine the status of our enthusiasm and the degree of confidence we hold for those in authority.

I have a feeling that the deepest concern shared by millions of citizens today is that

their Government has established a national system of internal security which is becoming more powerful and having a more direct influence on their daily lives than the Government which created it. It becomes increasingly apparent in their minds that the last word has been spoken when some security officer or hearing board puts them to the test. These citizens haven't lost much of their confidence in their leaders but they have lost most of their faith in the octopus-like apparatus which these men and women put together. They feel that this machine has treated them, or it may at some later date, unfairly, unreasonably, and too impersonally. Once caught in the clutches of the machine, it seems to them that sympathetic authorities to whom they turn are powerless to rectify any wrong or to correct any evil.

Citizens generally have few illusions about the age of peril in which all of us live. They understand the domestic need for making our Nation strong and secure. They will not oppose any sound effort to separate the guilty from the innocent in any field which affects their Nation's health. They are prepared to be enthusiastic in any such effort. They want affirmatively to be a part of these endeavors.

The people want their Government to be as confident of their integrity and loyalty as they want to remain convinced that the Government is speaking for and through them and not at or against them.

For the present, millions of citizens do not know what to think. These citizens have become bewildered and troubled by the contradictions between stated purposes and administrative results. They remain aware of the official declarations of intent and purpose regarding the act of August 26, 1950, and Executive Order 10450 which was dated April 27, 1953. This act and order cover 2,400,000 individuals within the Federal establishment. Their intention is to determine that only loyal and trustworthy persons are to be retained or employed. Every employee has been advised that he could expect fair, impartial, and equitable treatment at the hands of his Government which would utilize consistent standards of procedure as between Federal departments and agencies.

The vast differences between purpose and result have been properly acknowledged and emphasized by the procedural changes and refinements recently worked out by the Attorney General and approved for adoption by the President. If these improvements are imperatively required, then citizens within and beyond the Federal establishment have been consistent and right in their oft-repeated contentions of alarm.

What these improvements, when taken in the aggregate, amount to seems to be this: Meticulous care will be exercised in determining whether derogatory information justifies suspending an employee; an accused employee is to be advised of what he is charged with in language he can understand; this statement is to be given to him at the time he receives notice of suspension; the charges against the employee will be drafted in consultation with a legal officer who will make certain that the language is meaningful; the accused and the proper agency authority will meet in conference before the employee is suspended; an opinion will be secured from the agency general counsel as to the sufficiency of information justifying suspension; a legal officer will be present at a security board hearing to advise the accused as to his rights; when agencies are in dispute over an employee, they shall first consult with each other before publicly announcing decisions; and, efforts will be made to produce witnesses for the Government so that the accused may confront some among his accusers and cross-examine them.

Many disinterested critics believe these improvements to be an acknowledgment of criticism rather than a desire to reform the system. I do not share this attitude. In my judgment, the improvements are fundamentally important and they are evidence of officialdom's intentions to consider and press for additional changes.

The knowledge we must keep in mind is that it took the better part of 20 months to solidify these minimum standards of fairness. We ought to perfect machinery which will be self-correcting at a much more rapid pace.

Some of those who have resisted change seem to imply that a system which is just is not capable of being a system which is firm. I denounce this reasoning in an effort to protect those who maintain it. We all want a system to severly punish the disloyal while removing the true security risk from the Federal structure. Can you point to a single one of the recent improvements which softens the firmness of results desired? Firmness and justness are obviously compatible.

These improvements are merely a practical bar to persecution and they make hasty or thoughtless or obviously bad judgments less likely. To me, they represent something more. They begin to remind me of the flavor of the Bill of Rights. They put a nose back on an otherwise faceless person. Because of them, an accused will smell a more refreshing atmosphere. The sculptor's remaining task is to provide these faceless individuals, now possessed of a nose, with ears, eyes, and a mouth.

Does the Government have an adequate answer to the expressed concern by the people that our systems of internal security are growing to be more powerful than the Government? Like you, I wish I knew. It has been suggested that the President appoint, with approval from the Congress, a commission of outstanding citizens to concern itself basically with policy questions relating to internal security. Without sidetracking this proposal with finality, the Administration has thought that the Internal Security Section within the Justice Department can reappraise and advocate refinements and policy changes which the future may require.

I think it possible that the Justice Department could do the job but I feel most strongly that a commission would have the better chance of being more effective, persuasive, and helpful to the Nation.

In matters concerning aggression from the outside and the readiness and strength of our military posture at home, the President has available to him advice from the National Security Council. This instrument does not represent the views of a single Department of the Government. It reflects the consolidated and weighted views of the Government. When this Council speaks, the Nation believes that it is betting a balanced estimate of a given situation.

When it comes to important questions relating to internal security, the President receives his advice from several Departments but these views, as I understand channels of authority, are not necessarily coordinated nor do they always address themselves to the problem as a whole.

When the Attorney General talks about internal security, he almost invariably makes reference to the Federal employees security program. When the President talks with you about the same subject, he may be addressing himself to the Federal employees program or to the security plan in the Armed Forces or the industrial security program which is administered by the several services within the Defense Department, or to the Atomic Energy Commission's security procedures or to the International Organization Employee Loyalty Program.

Certainly the improvements recently adopted for the Federal employees program are not required to be accepted by the other programs.

If an ambition is to achieve uniform and consistent standards and procedures throughout the Federal structure, I can think of no sounder way to approach the problem than through a detached and distinguished nonpartisan commission of some sort.

I think the President would feel better if the recommendations from such a commission were available to him and I know that the Congress and the public would derive a better understanding of what is going on and what should take place in the future.

We do not suffer from any lack of the persons wholly qualified to sit on a commission. Had I the happy assignment of making selections, there would be room for any former President of our Republic. I would look for the experience possessed by retired members of our higher courts. Some exceedingly splendid minds are ready to be used from within both parties in each House of the Congress. Other national leaders in private life, both men and women, would surely respond to the challenge with energetic alacrity. There would be no problem in staffing a commission to the entire and grateful satisfaction of the Nation.

We often think it a pity that former leaders and builders in one field or another are put out to pasture when they have so much left to offer for the common good. Any among these could be employed for the benefit of everybody.

I am thrilled by the possibility that such a commission may, in due time, be agreed to and established. If our Nation didn't then have every ounce of confidence in the pronouncements to be anticipated, then we shall have lost our capacity for confidence.

Should a commission be authorized, the name of which might be the National Internal Security Council, then our President or those who follow him would be more fully prepared to master the uncertainties of our tomorrows. He or they could listen and consider advice which would accelerate our Nation's strength in all possible fashions.

A simple announcement that a commission is to be established would signify that the marriage between security and politics had been annulled. The cheering to take place all over this land would be heard throughout the world.

In utter sincerity, I do maintain that political considerations in security questions has been the major source of our discontent and diminishing confidence in authority since the close of World War II.

There is no reason to say that one political party has been more responsible for this mischief than the other. Under circumstances which prevailed, each party sought to claim the credit for knowing more about security and freedom than the other. National campaigns have revolved around who was going to do what to whom in these fields. There has been no agency within the several administrations and few individuals who have been considered to be disinterested and objectively minded. The charge and countercharge are the weapons employed by partisan minds everywhere. One party is maligned for having attempted too little and the other party is criticized for having attempted too much. Republican and Democratic Party supporters mostly restrict their views to what their articulate spokesmen say. The independent voter picks and chooses from competing headlines.

A commission would have a far better chance of having its judgments considered on their merits. Much of what is good today is disregarded, held suspect, or neglected because it is written off as being politically inspired. The commission could stop most of this. It would, I think, place the greater emphasis on what rather than who is right and best for the Nation in the complicated equations which are the ingredients in the realm of internal security.

It is not for me to say that we shall or shall not construct a commission. Regardless of who future managers are to be, there remains much to be undertaken and more

to be thought about by every citizen or public servant who has any regard for liberty or responsibility for any phase of internal security.

On my own responsibility, I soberly but gladly offer some suggestions and raise several questions which may be of broad concern for they are by no means restricted to the Federal employees security program under Executive Order 10450. We are not so fortunate presently as to be operating under a single security system.

Every suggestion to be made is predicated on the assumption, in which I believe, that what we Americans and our leaders actually want most is a maximum of firmness and a maximum of justness in any internal security system or systems to bear a stamp of legitimacy and approval in the United States.

First. Are we likely to develop a sufficient number of qualified security officers, hearing board members, and administrators to supervise, coordinate, operate, and understand prevailing security programs without establishing training schools of the highest order? The answer seems to be self-evident.

No individual is permitted to practice law or medicine or teach or be an FBI agent or become an officer in any branch of the armed services without extensive training which is thorough, intensive, and specialized. Is there less need for training in the person who deals with the preciousness of another's reputation?

Those within the Government who most strongly defend the policies behind our security systems often admit that a lack of experience has caused admitted abuses. What is being done to provide the right kind of experience?

If the age of peril goes on for half a century, our security systems will be continued for the same or longer length of time. It is provocative to think that some of our grandchildren may express the wish to be security officers rather than cowboys or professors or sailors when they grow up.

People ask how many citizens are now investigated, examined, or heard through security systems. I suppose that an accurate answer does not exist. If you add the 2½ million Federal employees to the several million now requiring clearances in industry, plus our citizens employed by the United Nations, the thousands of officers in the armed services, the considerable totals covered by the AEC, and perhaps higher maritime figures, you can reasonably conclude that as many as 20 million Americans are affected directly or indirectly today. When the breadwinner gets covered or in trouble, his family is concerned or in trouble, too.

We have built our systems faster than we could control them effectively or fairly. It is past time that we caught up. Were international tensions to increase by a few percentage points, or if we go to war, and our security programs expand accordingly, we would possess neither the personnel nor experience to master the difficulties.

The result would be security without direction or purpose, or a purpose without security. While nobody is shooting at us, we ought to prepare for any storm.

Second. Item 2 of the recently adopted 7 improvements said "meticulous care should be exercised in the matter of suspension of employees against whom derogatory information has been received."

I have long wondered why any alleged security risk, particularly those holding nonsensitive positions, should be suspended prior to the hearing to which an individual is entitled. What purpose really is served by these suspensions? On the basis of the record which points out that many of the persons accused are cleared and restored to duty after their hearing, it taxes credulity to agree that our security has been strengthened by the suspensions. It is easier to agree that human beings have been needlessly hurt.

If there is reason to suspend an employee as an alleged security risk, there must be ample grounds for holding a hearing. Why the suspension and then delay before the hearing? Why? Is this practice to be called firmness? Is this treatment to be thought of as being just?

A hearing is held to determine whether the retention in employment in the Federal service of a particular individual is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security. Why not notify the employee that the question is pending through a statement to him which relates the when, where, whom, and what to the charges against him; then give this employee a reasonable period for preparing his defense; then hold the hearing which will recommend his dismissal or retention without any further prejudice.

Would the Government be harmed if this practice became the custom? How could it be harmed?

What about the employee who has been suspended with several months to wait before his hearing? He watches his limited resources rapidly evaporate. The statement of charges he carries in his pocket has too often been too vague for some outside attorney to understand; his family begins to wonder where their next meal is coming from; his neighbors think it strange that he spends so much time around the house; his children are pleased at first but they begin to wonder soon; if he is innocent of any wrongdoing, and this is more often the case than not, he just wonders and suffers, and generally prays.

How many times does this employee resign after having been suspended because he thinks he doesn't have a chance and there is no point in requesting a hearing? There is every logical reason not to agree with those who blithely point to a resignation after suspension as being an admission of guilt. A man must earn and live. If he can't afford the waiting and the money to defend himself at a future hearing, he must get to work at something because his family must eat and his children must go on going to school.

On November 22, 1954, a clerk, a GS–4, I think, was suspended by a great agency of the Government for it was alleged that she had been a member of the Washington Book Shop in either 1940 or 1941. This she denied under oath. Her hearing was held on March 2, 1955. No decision had been reached on last Monday when I committed this reference to paper. Is any such suspension justified? How could her retention, pending a hearing, impose either trouble or injury on the agency? What has the action of that agency done to her enthusiasm and confidence in her Government?

The more I consider the practice of suspension before hearings, the more I believe that it weakens but does not strengthen internal security.

Third. Under the seven new improvements, it is provided that a legal officer be present at security board hearings to advise the employee, if not represented by counsel, as to his rights under Executive Order 10450, as amended, and the pertinent regulations.

Here we encounter the question, "Is not the employee entitled to something more than a mere recitation of his rights?" Why should he not be assisted by the Government in his defense? That Government does not wish to persecute him; it endeavors rather to determine if the employee is, in fact, a security risk.

The court-marial has long been employed by the armed services as an instrument of security and fairness. This court provides competent counsel for any draftee or professional serviceman who is brought before it. Is the civil servant less entitled to protection than the individual who volunteers or is required to wear the uniform of his country? Are we content to say that one is a judicial and the other an administrative proceeding? Is it not apparent that careers and reputations are equally at stake?

The accused before a military court-martial is actually less in need of legal assistance, which he gets automatically, than is the accused before a security-board hearing, who either contracts for his legal aid on the outside or goes without.

Testimony before a court-martial is restricted; that admitted by a security-board hearing may be anything, everything, or practically nothing. The one who stands accused before this administrative body needs, and I think he is deserving of, legal assistance from the agency which submits the charges.

Private bar associations are offering legal assistance free of charge to Federal employees involved in security-risk cases. As a taxpayer, I resent the implication that a public servant must be protected from his Government by outside help.

If our policy becomes that of providing legal assistance to those accused, would we be less than firm in our Nation's desire to rid the Government of undesirables? You know we would not.

The absence of legal assistance is perlexing enough for the civil servant but even more demanding of consideration in the field of industrial security. Its only three hearing boards are situated in San Francisco, Chicago, and New York. The persons here concerned for the most part are scientists, engineers, and skilled technicians. They must travel to and from the hearings at their own expense. All of the many other costs, including attorney fees, come out of their own pockets. Why shouldn't too many of those accused just quit after suspension and seek employment in some nondefense industry? Many of them do and their departure hurts them less than it does the Government which needs every superior mind and skill it can prevail upon to contribute to the defense effort.

This question of legal aid in its entirety has no ready answer. Is it not deserving of public study and exploration?

Fourth. The sixth improvement, recently announced, says that even though the statute does not provide subpena power, every effort should be made to provide witnesses for the Government to be confronted and cross-examined by the accused, so long as their presence would not jeopardize the national security.

This seems to be more of an expression of hope than reality. How many witnesses who provide unsworn derogatory information will respond to an invitation to appear, to be sworn, to submit to cross-examination, and to pay whatever travel and living costs are involved? My guess is that very few will show up.

If we have a pressing need for security boards, as we do, should they not be equipped with every facility for reaching decisions which are firm and just? Without the subpena power, these boards must do a lot of guessing, which can impose real and avoidable harm and trouble on either the Government or the employee. At least, it appears so to me.

The Government employs undercover agents, paid informers, and casual informers, for whom it wishes to guarantee anonymity. This is a touchy question, but I think it not indiscreet to refer to my understanding of the casual informer. Most of us have been casual informers from time to time. Investigators ask us what we know or desire to say about our friends, coworkers, associates, and acquaintances. Should we not be willing to say under oath and at a hearing what we have freely said, be that derogatory or praiseworthy, within the four walls of our home or office? If we are unwilling, should we not be required to support our judgment or retract it?

The accused employee is constantly impressed by the sad consequences to result

if he does not tell the truth. I think it sadder that he can be torn to shreds by the tongue of a person he never sees. Perjury ought to be as applicable to the accuser as to the accused.

The Government has stated in the improvements that the rights of the Government and of the employees are fully safeguarded when persons possessing the highest degree of integrity, ability, and good judgment sit as members of security boards. Such qualities when unrelated to established knowledge are often wasted and work in the dark.

Five. Contradictions between security systems could be reconciled with a resulting clearer understanding and increased confidence in the public's mind. How a division within the Justice Department can bring this unity about, assuming it to be desirable, I do not know. Certainly assistance from the Congress would be necessary.

Under Executive Order 10450, the applicant with derogatory information against him may or may not be told that such exists or the nature of it. The person for whom he seeks to work can discuss the question with him but is not required to do so. If the applicant surmises that there is a security question about his employment, there is no official avenue through which he can be fully or factually informed. Generally he hears nothing from official sources and he seldom receives the sought-after appointment.

Under the Atomic Energy Commission's procedures, the same applicant would be advised of the derogatory charges, encouraged to answer, and automatically granted a hearing if he desired one.

Under the industrial-security plan, this applicant would automatically be denied employment for any assignment requiring a clearance. Industry has no preemployment examination to clear away derogatory information.

AEC hearing board members are largely distinguished private citizens. Those under Executive Order 10450 are all employees within the Federal establishment, while those who serve on industrial security boards are officers from the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or civilians who are generally retired officers from the armed services.

Under Executive Order 10450 and the industrial-security system, the standard by which employees are retained is whether their retention is clearly consistent with the national security.

Under the Atomic Energy Commission, personnel is retained if their retention will not endanger the common defense and security.

These standards and procedures are poles apart. Some among them are infinitely preferable to others. The present is the best time to make the choice.

Those who believe as I do would never advocate a system which denies an opportunity to any applicant to explain away or clear up the derogatory information which has been filed against him. Unless it is cleared away, this individual, who may be totally above legitimate criticism, is not likely to have a reasonable chance for Federal employment in any other agency. Once you have any kind of written record with the Government, it becomes your shadow and follows you everywhere. If there is a cloud on that record, you may be well thought of elsewhere but hardly by the Government.

The pride I want to have in my Government does not permit me to view with favor any machinery which seemingly favors a standard of mediocrity over a standard of excellence. Unless registered derogatory information is examined in consultation with its subject, our Government will be more and more inclined to accept for employment only those against whom nothing bad or little good is said. Many of these applicants will become first-rate personnel but a large number will be unimaginative drones of the first order. We ought more readily to appreciate human nature. The most intelligent and progressive people we can think of are supported by many friends and opposed, sub rosa and less often publicly, by many enemies. Greed, jealousy and selfishness often are reflected in the derogatory information registered against an applicant.

It will take time, thought, desire and money to be more thorough and careful in evaluating an applicant's Form 57. In doing so, however, the strength of our Government would be increased. In clearing away derogatory information about a particular individual, it might well result that he or she was possessed of the qualities and driving force of genius. Has our Government, speaking for the people, ever been more in need of these characteristics?

Sixth. In 1947, the Attorney General was directed by the President to compile a list of organizations thought to be totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive. Memberships in organizations on this list were to be considered by the Civil Service Commission in judging the loyalty of applicants and public servants in the Federal service.

The organizations on the Attorney General's current subversive list totals more than 250. Some 75 of these organizations have been listed since 1952.

Every applicant for the Federal service and every employee within that service has been required to state whether he is currently or has ever been a member of any organization listed by the Attorney General.

Is it not proper to explore the desirability of eliminating that portion of the question which relates to memberships which were resigned or renounced or which lapsed prior to the listing which was first made public in 1947?

If an individual's conduct, attainments, and attitudes have been above reproach during the past 8 years, or since 1947, is it not a legitimate calculated risk to assume that he had been a loyal citizen during the years which went before? I think the risk can be intelligently taken.

By what training are we qualified to examine the years and conditions before 1947? No more than a mere handful of persons have any knowledge about the history, character, make up and purposes of most of the listed organizations. Who among your acquaintances has any knowledge about them? The fact is that a large majority of those who evaluate applications and investigate civil servants are without sufficient knowledge to reach a rational judgment covering the past. They interpret the list, which is all they have before them, in any way they please.

Is it not logical to understand that one may have joined the Workers Alliance because unemployed, or taken out a card at the Washington Book Shop during the early 1940's in order to buy books or records at a discount, or joined one of the friendship-with-Russia groups during the World War II alliance, without in any of these cases ever knowing that the organization was subversive or controlled by the Communists?

Has our society become so lacking in vitality, vision and strength that we must pour over the ashes of a dead period in the past which will not be fully analyzed by historians for another 50 years? When this Nation of ours fought its way West to open up new frontiers, a contributor was judged for what he could do and for what he was rather than against any standard to evaluate what he had been in the years of his youth and growth. I am not suggesting that we give consideration only to memberships which were taken out in this year. I am bluntly suggesting that an examination of a person's record over an 8-year period from 1947 to 1955 is sufficient to judge the usefulness and loyalty of that person at this moment and for the future.

This question, concerning the past, when raised becomes demanding of discussion and thought.

When the Nation substituted a broader security program for a restricted loyalty program, the Attorney General's list was supplied to the heads of all departments and agencies for use by their security apparatus. This list is presently being employed for many purposes beyond the security program—for passport denials; by local officials and private owners to deny meeting halls; and for teachers' oaths to state but several.

The Attorney General's list, when related to memberships prior to 1947, excepting previous membership in the Communist Party, USA, is causing an extravagant and futile waste of time and energy which ought to be utilized in seeking solutions for problems of the present.

All I do professionally is to work on those portions of the list which cover alleged Communist organizations. My experience has taught me, or I have grown to believe, that memberships in these groups are often absolutely meaningless unless they are related to when, where and why.

The Attorney General is presently seeking to list the National Lawyers Guild as the legal mouthpiece for communism in our country, but had I been an enterprising law-school undergraduate or Negro lawyer in the late 1930's, I would probably have joined it. The American Bar Association of that period did not permit Negroes to membership nor did it provide any limited membership for the undergraduate who sought a close association with his legal elders. Had I joined and then resigned before 1945, should I now be held suspect and penalized for having been ambitious in my youth?

A person may have been a dupe in joining a listed organization which is thought now to have been subversive but it does not follow that he necessarily was disloyal. With respect to those who resigned from these organizations before they were listed by the Attorney General, I think we can easily afford to assume that the resignation was initiated for cause by a good American.

Among my own friends are those who renounced their memberships in given organizations some years before they were listed. These individuals were more farsighted than their Government, but instead of being praised, they have been too often denied Federal employment. Is this reaction by authorities the exercise of commonsense?

Do you remember when people were fired from the Government for expressing antagonistic views about our wartime alliance and friendship with our Communist ally, Soviet Russia? Do we forget that Communists were commissioned in our armed services not long ago? Can you not recollect the public encouragement given to some of the listed organizations by the most prominent public and private personalities during World War II? How many of the members of that period joined because their leaders spoke out in open praise for the organizations? A very large number were so stimulated, encouraged, or coerced.

That period of our past from 1930 through 1945 was a confused, groping, bewildering series of contradictions. We fought and suffered through a depression and engaged in a global war. We kept company with some strange and disagreeable allies and fair-weather friends. We did all of this in an agonizing and amazing effort to conquer the unknown and to keep our liberties. In having done both, is it not practical, humane, and desirable to forget the past before 1947 so that we may do a better job of going forward from there and from now?

One trouble with going backward is that of never knowing where to stop. What organization will be listed tomorrow in which past memberships will embarrass and cloud the reputations of those now employed who

are considered above reproach by their superiors and friends.

Seventh. There is more to ponder over in the Attorney General's list than memberships before 1947. The question which intrigues me is what ought to be done with the Attorney General's list?

I am not the first to be so intrigued. The Congress spent years in working for an answer.

The Internal Security Act of 1950 established the Subversive Activities Control Board. The function of this body is to adjudicate the merits of cases through which the Attorney General alleges that organizations exist in this country which are dominated, directed, infiltrated, and controlled by international communism or by the Communist Party, U. S. A.

In these proceedings, the Board moves with cautious thoroughness because the sanctions to be applied to Communist-action or Communist-front organizations are severe and onerous. The Attorney General is required to establish his allegations to be true, as would any prosecutor before any court, and the respondent is provided with every opportunity to prove that the allegations are unfounded in fact, as he would be encouraged to do before any bar of justice.

If this process of adjudication is desirable, should we not speed up the process and thus move in the direction of liquidating the Attorney General's list? Without this process, the Attorney General's list, as it refers to Communist organizations, would remain outstanding in perpetuity without being adjudicated. Any fair-minded American would be made to feel uncomfortable by any prospect of this kind.

Many of the organizations on the Attorney General's list are said to have been inspired and organized by Fascist, totalitarian, or subversive movements unrelated to communism. How are the facts about these organizations to be established? Many of the organizations have been dead for years and in this sense, they are defenseless. Should we go on casting discredit on individuals who belonged to this type of organization many years ago?

The Internal Security Act of 1950 might be amended to provide the same method for adjudicating totalitarian, Fascist, and subversive organizations as is now provided for Communist organizations. Otherwise these non-Communist but subversive organizations will continue to be listed, without much meaning, forever and a day.

Some of the listed organizations had but a single purpose and brief existence. Shall all of those who belonged to these groups be held suspect for as long as they live? Would it not serve the public interest to eliminate all of the deadwood from the Attorney General's list as soon as possible?

I can give you a dozen reasons why we ought to hurry with this pressing task of liquidating the Attorney General's list. The most illuminating reason is to be found in a question which the Department of Defense in its industrial security program requires to be answered by any person who seeks a clearance to handle classified information. This question reads: "Are you now associating with or have you within the past 5 years associated with any individual, including relatives, who you know or have reason to believe are or have been members of any of the organizations designated by the Attorney General as having interests in conflict with those of the United States?"

If your answer to this question is "Yes," even though you make reference to a cousin five times removed or to a casual friend with whom you share an occasional glass of beer, your answer in itself constitutes derogatory information against you. If the answer is "Yes" and you are an applicant rather than an employee, you have closed the door to employment in your own face. If the answer is "No," but others think it should be "Yes," you may find it exceedingly difficult to clear away the seeming discrepancy. If the answer is "Yes," but others believe it should be "No," then you have placed them in a dilemma which may ensnare you before it has been resolved.

We are not accustomed to any citizens' informer system in this country. Yet, throughout defense plants in American industry, we have established one. In the above question we are asking citizens to probe the past from which their coworkers, relatives, and friends have come. Who among us is knowing enough to relate the past to circumstances which prevailed? This is a task to be assumed only by the most knowing professionals.

Though I personally believe this procedure is not in our Nation's best interest, I am constrained to inquire as to why the question to which I have referred is not included as a question in the Federal employment form 57? If there is need for an all-inclusive informer system within industry, there ought to be a like need for such a system within the Government. Perhaps, on reflection, those who take action in these matters will consider any citizens' informer system within industry or the Government to be as distasteful and harmful in the long run as I do.

The Attorney General's list ought, in my judgment, to be liquidated through procedures which our country supports. The merits of the charges against any listed organization should be adjudicated. Sanctions should apply to those who remain as members after an organization has been found to be guilty as alleged by the Attorney General. We ought to permit and encourage those who resign or have previously quit, to work and travel without restraint or prejudice. In what other way can the list be liquidated? In what other fashion can fairness be maintained? In what other way can we distinguish between those who are dedicated to an un-American cause, and those who seek a way out as soon as they are given established reason to believe that they have been hoodwinked. Many among us have been silly, foolish, and stupid in the years of our past but how many among us have or want to be disloyal? That list is remarkably short. This knowledge ought to make us cheerful and keep us so.

There remains an important question to be raised concerning any Attorney General's authority to list organizations as being subversive or un-American. What should the time lag be between his listing an organization and when he prosecutes his charges before a body of competent jurisdiction? Until the prosecution of a case is undertaken, the listing authority remains as judge, jury, and prosecutor. This is hardly in keeping with our historic tradition of charge, prosecution, and verdict. In my opinion, no organization should be listed unless it is simultaneously announced that prosecution will be initiated in the case within a period of several months. Is this attitude unreasonable? Would its adoption endanger our desire to be firm with those who are found to be our enemies? I raise the question because we are no closer to adjudicating some of the listed organizations than we were on a day in 1947 when the organizations were publicly listed. We need a better answer to this question than has been available during 8 long years. We continue to list organizations much more rapidly than they are being disposed of.

Your patience this morning has been quite remarkable but the depth of my appreciation for your interest and invitation is comparable. In departing from your presence, I take away to be treasured always a stimulating, encouraging, heart-warming memory.

I leave you with this wrap-up conviction and expressed hope.

The complete measure of a government, like that of an individual, can only be judged by the fashion in which it assumes and fulfills its unenforceable obligations.

These are the areas of public concern we have emphasized today. We expect and pray that our government will be just in its treatment of every citizen not because the laws of our land so require in every instance, for they do not, but because that government wants and will remain determined to be just.

In this Republic, the Government represents, acts, and speaks for us, its people. It continues for us, the people, to petition that government while joining minds, hearts, and hands with it in ways destined to sharpen the unlimited powers of liberty; to keep the Nation progressive, alert, and resourceful; to provide a climate in which the individual is self-reliant, self-respecting, and free.

May health and happiness bless you all.

I wish you well.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Joseph Campbell to be Comptroller General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joseph Campbell to be Comptroller General of the United States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joseph Campbell, of New York, to be Comptroller General of the United States? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Joseph Campbell.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following the vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Campbell, a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The Senate should disapprove the nomination of Joseph Campbell for appointment as Comptroller General of the United States.

I have arrived at this conclusion after careful study of the history of the Office and its functions as an agency of the legislative branch of the Government, with which Mr. Campbell has had no previous knowledge or experience.

While Mr. Campbell undoubtedly is qualified in the accounting field, one of the functions performed by the Comptroller General, he is completely lacking in legal, judicial, or

legislative experience and training, which, in our view, are essential requirements for the performance of the quasi-judicial functions of the Office and in carrying out other important responsibilities of the Comptroller General.

Although it is not required that an appointee to the position of Comptroller General must necessarily be a lawyer, I do believe that any nominee who has had no legal, judicial, or legislative training lacks the essential qualifications to carry out the duties and responsibilities vested in the Office by the basic statutes under which the General Accounting Office was established and which govern its operations.

The Office of the Comptroller General was created to provide the Congress with a fiscal and legal agent, vested with quasi-judicial authority, whose duty it would be to audit the accounts of all Federal agencies; to review the manner in which executive branch departments and agencies are executing and administering programs authorized by Congress; and to analyze the expenditure of appropriated funds to insure compliance with the intent of the Congress under legislation which authorized the programs. Thus, his responsibility to the legislative branch includes reporting deficiencies in administration, waste, and extravagance in the expenditure of appropriated funds, and providing the Congress with essential information relative to operations of the Federal Government upon which legislative action must be based.

The Comptroller General is required by law to prepare and issue numerous decisions covering practically the entire range of Government operations, many of which are extremely complex and highly controversial. He must also resolve questions arising out of the normal operations of the General Accounting Office; render decisions on the legality of Federal expenditures, with particular reference to whether programs under which funds are to be expended have been authorized by law and that the manner of their expenditure conforms to the intent of the Congress; review the legality of Federal contracts and expenditures made pursuant thereto, as well as the settlement of accounts and claims against the Federal Government. His decisions are binding on the executive branch and are often considered and cited by the Federal courts.

In order to perform these duties properly, the Comptroller General must have had experience with and a detailed knowledge of the legislative process, or sufficient legal training to enable him to evaluate the intent of the statutes approved by the Congress and to report fully on deviations from the intent of Congress.

The legislative history of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, which created the General Accounting Office and the Office of the Comptroller General, clearly demonstrates the emphasis placed by the Congress on the importance of making the Office entirely independent of executive control, with sole responsibility to the legislative branch. Serious consideration was given to placing the appointment of the Comptroller General under the control of the Congress itself, in order to insure that the appointee would be responsible only to the legislative branch. It was determined, however, that such a provision of law would be an infringement on the appointive powers of the President, and, after extensive debate, the power to make the nomination was vested in the President, with the added legislative control that he could be removed by the Congress by the passage of a joint resolution (which would require Presidential approval).

The debates in Congress clearly illustrate the fact that this appointive power was reluctantly vested in the President as a matter of necessity so as to meet other requirements of law. To emphasize its desire to insure the separation of legislative and executive powers under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, the Congress also provided in the act for the establishment of the Bureau of the Budget, headed by an officer—the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—who would serve the executive in a capacity similar to that in which the Comptroller General was to serve the Congress. The act did not require Senate confirmation of this officer on the premise that he should be responsible only to the President, and could be appointed or removed at the will of the President without congressional interference or Senate approval, as is required of all other officials of the Government appointed to positions of similar importance.

Under present policy, unless there is some question raised as to the qualifications of the appointee or his fitness for the office, nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for appointive positions in the executive branch are confirmed under a more or less routine procedure, based on the premise that the President has the right to select officials who will be responsible to his direction and qualified to carry out his policies without congressional interference. An appointee to the Office of the Comptroller General, however, being accepted generally as one responsive only to the legislative branch, should have required, in the view of the minority, not only the consent but the advice of the Senate. No information was submitted at the hearings to indicate that the President consulted with or sought the advice of Members of Congress before submitting the nomination of Mr. Campbell to the Senate. Thus, there arises the question of whether Mr. Campbell, should he be confirmed by the Senate as a Presidential appointee, would be responsive to the wishes of the President or the Congress, in the event of a serious controversy between the executive and legislative branches which he might be called upon to resolve.

During the quarter century that the General Accounting Office has been in existence, and the Comptroller has acted to assist the Congress in retaining its control over the expenditure of public funds, a number of efforts have been made to weaken the powers vested in that office, and to transfer certain of its functions to the executive branch. The Congress has strenuously and successfully resisted these moves.

It is my view that the Senate should reject the confirmation of Mr. Campbell, in order that the Congress may make certain that the General Accounting Office will continue to perform functions essential to the retention of congressional supervision over Federal expenditures, and to insure that the legislative branch may retain its status as a coequal branch of the Government.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 51, Senate Resolution 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 57) authorizing further expenditures and temporary employment of additional assistants by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 57) which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "authorized", to strike out "until" and insert "through", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making studies as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and pursuant to its jurisdiction under rule XXV (1) (d) 4 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized through January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and with the consent of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the resolution provides for more clerical help for the Banking and Currency Committee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question, I will say that the committee report which was submitted in connection with the resolution carries a suggested budget. The committee has been carrying on an investigation since last April, I believe, or about that time, and we did not propose to use more help; in fact, I do not think we will use even as much help as we used during the investigation last year; but additional help is needed. The budget is set forth in the report of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The resolution provides for what?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It provides for a continuing investigation and a study of the whole housing program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there are quite a few resolutions on the calendar calling for the expenditure of more and more money. I thought that before we proceeded to the individual consideration of these resolutions I would make a preliminary statement as to the resolutions, and then, as each resolution comes before the Senate, it is my hope to obtain a little more detail in trying to ascertain the necessity for it.

I dislike to make myself, may I say, more or less obnoxious to many of the Members of the Senate and the investigative staffs when I take the floor to ascertain the purposes of the many resolutions which are submitted at the beginning of each Congress.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, many, if not all, of these resolutions authorizing funds for so-called temporary investigations are submitted with the statement of the proponents that "We hope to get through

this session without further expenditures." But that is seldom the case, Mr. President. As I have frequently pointed out, unlike the old soldier who never dies but merely fades away, these special committees not only never die, but they seem to grow larger and stronger as time goes on. They become more powerful and healthier. There are, as I have previously pointed out, professional staffmen on Capitol Hill—professional investigators, if you will—who make it their business to either expand their investigations, or to create more and more of these special committees so as to preserve and perpetuate their jobs and their lucrative salaries. The record I have before me testifies adequately as to their success, Mr. President.

In 1940, the amount of money which was appropriated for special investigation committees was $170,268.04. From year to year, the amounts increased. In 1945 the amount had increased from $170,268.04 to $427,574.

During the fiscal year 1947, the first year after the passage of the Reorganization Act in 1946, special investigation costs increased to $692,603.65.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Was it not at that time that the special committees were forbidden, by a rule of the Senate, to borrow personnel from executive departments? I well remember that at that time a special committee could be set up with only $3,000 or $4,000, and by borrowing the necessary personnel from the executive departments. But by a resolution adopted by the Senate, the borrowing of personnel from the executive departments of the Government was forbidden, and it became necessary for the committees to employ their own personnel. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. But the amount of the appropriations from 1946 onward, even after the adoption of the resolution to which the Senator has referred, has continued to increase, until today, as I shall point out in a few minutes, one committee of the Senate, the Judiciary Committee—headed by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia—will receive more than a million dollars in order to carry on its operations for this year alone.

I say it is time to call a halt to all these expenditures. I say it is time to cut down on staffs and eliminate the so-called temporary investigations which cost so much money.

Let me refresh the memory of the Senate as to the manner in which these temporary probes have multiplied and expanded.

In 1950, which was several years after the adoption of the resolution to which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has referred, the amount spent by the Senate on special investigations increased to $1,277,094.39.

In 1952, the amount was $1,727,000.

In 1953, it was $1,739,329.

Last year $1,936,217.29 was expended.

This shows a gradual but substantial increase from year to year. What is the outlook for 1955? I should like briefly to review the current status of these appropriations. The Senate, at this session of Congress, already has approved resolutions for the following special studies:

For the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to study certain interstate commerce problems, $200,000; for the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to study the internal security program, $125,000; for the Committee on Banking and Currency, to study the economic stabilization and mobilization problems, $100,000; for the Committee on Armed Services, a carryover from its investigation of the preparedness program, $63,647; for the Committee on Foreign Relations, to investigate the technical assistance program, $52,000; for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to investigate critical materials, $70,000; for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, general investigations, $60,000; for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to study pension funds, $190,000; for the Committee on Government Operations, for the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, $190,000.

This makes a total, already approved and acted upon, of $1,050,647 for the year 1955.

If the Senate today should adopt the resolutions which are now on the calendar, there will have been added to the $1,050,647, the further sum of $1,104,600, thereby making a grand total, for 1955, of $2,155,247.

That will be an increase of more than $200,000 over last year; and the year 1955 is still young; this is only March. I suspect that from this time forward, other committees will be coming before the Senate, asking for more money.

As I have just indicated the Senate has for consideration today 12 resolutions seeking amounts aggregating $1,104,647.

In that total are included the following appropriations: Internal Security Subcommittee, $260,000; Antitrust Subcommittee, a brand new investigatory body, $250,000—and this amount is being asked in the face of the fact that the Attorney General has been making surveys and studies of the antitrust laws for the past 2 years. Congress already has a wealth of information, previously gathered; yet the Senate today is being asked to provide another $250,000 in order to study the problem further. I say this is pure duplication of effort. It is not necessary, and it should not be done.

If the Attorney General has recommendations to make, they should be submitted, and I am sure in due course they will be submitted, to the Committee on the Judiciary; and I am also sure that the Judiciary Committee will undoubtedly recommend remedial legislation to the Senate. Such proposed legislation must necessarily be considered by the regular committee.

The $250,000 which the Senate is now being asked to appropriate is money which will simply be thrown down the drain.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the Senator from Louisiana is incorrect about the consideration of the reports made by the Attorney General. The subcommittee in question is a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. As such, it would be the one to hold hearings to consider the reports of the Attorney General.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no doubt that if the Senate follows the regular procedure, the recommendations of the Attorney General will be submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that committee will undoubtedly suggest amendments to the law. As a rule, it is the full committee which considers the reports, not special committees.

The Senator knows as well as I do that what the special committees do is to hold hearings. After they have concluded the hearings, the subcommittees submit their findings and recommendations to the full committees. It often happens that the full committee will then look into the matter and decide whether the recommendations should be enacted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The chairman of Committee on the Judiciary is present and can speak for himself, but I submit that in that committee—and I suppose the same practice is followed in most other committees—matters affecting the antitrust laws, and similar laws, are submitted to a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings and investigations, following which the subcommitte makes its report to the full committee.

The Committee on the Judiciary as a whole has so much business before it that it would not be possible to have it considered by the committee as a whole; therefore, it is necessary to refer it to subcommittees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Unquestionably the Attorney General spent thousands of dollars in order to gather the information upon which he expects to base his recommendations to the Committee on the Judiciary; and no doubt he will recommend that some laws be enacted.

The Senator from Tennessee knows what the procedure is, and I shall demonstrate it in a minute with respect to the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, of which the Senator, as I understand, will be the chairman. That subcommittee has been in existence during the years 1953 and 1954.

The committee has traveled in many parts of the country. It has submitted a report indicating what the trouble is, and suggesting legislation. What is going to happen with respect to those recommendations? As I understand, proposed legislation will be submitted, and when that is done the bill will go to the full committee, and the committee will hold hearings or accept the recommendations of the special committee and determine whether or not it should proceed with efforts to get the legislation enacted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; but the work of getting the facts, the pros and cons, and reporting the necessity in connection with the proposed legislation,

whether it is the juvenile delinquency subcommittee or the antitrust monopoly subcommittee, will be work carried on by subcommittees. It would be impossible to carry on the work otherwise.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why the reorganization law was enacted. Each standing committee was authorized to appoint 4 specialists, 2 clerks, and 4 clerical employees. Each standing committee of the Senate is provided with a total of $95,000, which is appropriated each year, and which the committee can spend. That amount is to pay for the four specialists, or experts, the clerical assistants necessary, and for the purpose of holding hearings.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator would look at the calendar of the Committee on the Judiciary, he would find, in view of the very wide jurisdiction of the committee—and it is not the fault of the committee that Senators introduce many bills which are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary—that somewhere between 52 and 55 percent of all bills introduced in the Senate are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I know that the experience of the late Senator McCarran and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was, and I know that the experience of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] now is, that the regular staff of four professionals was not and is not able to do the work for the full committee, let alone all the subcommittees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me tell the Senator that before the Reorganization Act was passed I was chairman of the committee which considered all the private claims bills which the Committee on the Judiciary is now handling. I worked on that committee for 5 or 6 years, 4 of those years as chairman, and that committee handled all of this work at a total salary cost of $3,600. I do not know how many clerks the Committee on the Judiciary has engaged in that work.

Aside from that, we are providing the Attorney General with almost $100,000 to make studies of private claims bills before they come to the committee. We did not have that advantage before 1946, and I think we did a very good job. When I was chairman of the committee, we considered a large number of bills; 51 or 52 percent of the total number of bills passed by the Senate were reported by the then Claims Committee, of which I was privileged to be chairman. We had a great deal of work to do, yes, but we did the work ourselves, and we did not have numerous lawyers and clerks to do it. The Senators themselves did the work.

Nowadays it seems the order of the day to have attorneys and professional job seekers serving the committees, and to have the committees surrounded with a lot of clerical help. In addition to that, there seems to be a need to have somebody in the Attorney General's office do most of the work of investigating as to whether or not the special claims ought to be paid.

It is true Mr. President, that a lot of work has devolved on the Committee on the Judiciary because of the immigration laws which have been enacted. But the committee is especially provided with assistants to do that work. Extra help to do that work is provided for the Subcommittee on Immigration. That personnel handles the work; it is not the staff of the regular committee that does it.

In addition to the 4 professionals and the 6 clerical employees whom the Committee on the Judiciary has, what is provided? There are 2 additional professional workers and 3 clerks, to carry the extra load the Senator has just been discussing.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment, if the employees of the Committee on the Judiciary were to do the work assigned to them, there would be ample help available in the present force.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to say I do not know of any Senate employees who work harder than do the employees of the Committee on the Judiciary. They are busy all day. I know that many of them work at night. Many of them work very, very long hours.

It may be that when the Senator was handling claims bills, he was able to get more done than the present members of the committee are able to do, but I submit the burden of work on the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and on every member of the committee is very, very taxing, because as to every one of the claim bills, even though assistants are provided, the claimants want so see committee members and be heard. The same is true of immigration bills. I do not think the committee would be able to function at all, considering the burden of proposed legislation it carries, unless it had subcommittees and adequate staffs.

The Senator referred to the immigration subcommittee. That is one of the subcommittees requesting funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my friend from Tennessee that I am not questioning each one of the requests. I know it is necessary to increase some of the amounts previously provided. I know that. But the committee keeps burdening itself with more and more subcommittees. That is what I do not understand. As I pointed out a short time ago, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate would, standing by itself, be the first standing committee to have available over $1 million with which to operate this year. It would be the first committee to reach that level of expenditure, and I submit that it is a dubious distinction, indeed. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it is unconscionable. I am saying, Mr. President, that, if this matter were looked into by the chairman and others, probably 40 percent of that amount could be saved, and the work could be done just as well as it is being done now, or better.

Mr. President, I do not wish to go into all the resolutions in detail, but I should like to call attention to one in particular, and that is the one embodying the request of the juvenile delinquency subcommittee. That subcommittee was created 2 years ago, at the request of former Senator Hendrickson, of New Jersey. As I did when other new subcommittees were formed, I questioned the advisability of creating that special subcommittee. I do not suppose there is a problem confronting us that is better known than is the subject of juvenile delinquency. However, it should be considered more or less on the local level.

When the resolution was presented, the former distinguished Senator from New Jersey asked for $44,000. In debate, he stated to the Senate—and I was present—that he felt confident that if the Senate would give him that amount of money, he could complete the investigation and could make his report to the Senate. By the way, Mr. President, when my good friend, Senator Hendrickson, of New Jersey, made a further request, last year, for additional funds for this purpose, he acknowledged that he was in error when he said he could complete the investigation with only $44,000. At that time he made the following confession:

> Mr. ELLENDER. Since the Senator from New Jersey is the author of this resolution, I have no doubt that he will be appointed a member of the subcommittee. So I hope he will come to the Senate next year without a request for more funds.
>
> Mr. HENDRICKSON. I sincerely hope that I shall be able to come before the Senate and report exactly the result which the Senator from Louisiana wishes.

Mr. President, what happened? The subcommittee was organized. It spent the $44,000; and at the beginning of last year it returned to the Senate with a request for an additional $175,000. At that time I stood on the floor of the Senate and reminded Senator Hendrickson, of New Jersey, of what he had previously stated. I tried to have the requested $175,000 cut in half, because I felt that the only thing the subcommittee could do would be merely to dramatize the evils of juvenile delinquency; that the subcommittee could not do much about the problem; because it had to be dealt with more or less on the local level.

After considerable skirmishing and debate, the Senate rejected the amendment I suggested, and gave to the Hendrickson subcommittee the full sum of $175,000.

The subcommittee got busy. It held hearings in many of the large cities throughout the Nation; and at the beginning of this year, it submitted to the Senate a report of its findings. The subcommittee did not discover anything new, anything we did not already know. The subcommittee reported on a plan which would, in effect, help in the fight against this evil.

I have before me a clipping from the Washington Star of March 11, 1955—soon after the report was issued. In the article it is stated that 13 recommendations were made by the subcommittee. After studying the problem for a whole year, in addition to the 6 or 8 months during which it had studied it previously, the subcommittee made certain specific recommendations. It recommended, according to the article to which I have referred:

> 1. Federal aid to schools, "the Nation's first line of defense in preventing juvenile delinquency."

That was one of the recommendations. I now read the others, as reported in this article:

2. Federal grants of "risk capital" to set up demonstration projects in fighting juvenile delinquency.

3. Establishment of a Federal revolving fund to finance costs of returning the more than 200,000 runaway youngsters that burden States other than their own.

4. More and better probation, parole, and social case workers in all institutions and organizations dealing with juveniles—Federal, State, and local.

5. Federal assistance in training such workers.

6. Federal strengthening of laws requiring a runaway father to support his wife and children. This would include putting the District under the reciprocal nonsupport law.

7. Banning the transportation of pornography across State lines by any method. Federal law today prohibits the transport of such material by mail or common carrier. There is no Federal law prohibiting such transport in trucks or private cars.

8. Finding ways to get communities to develop programs to provide youngsters with jobs.

9. Giving juvenile courts, under attack from some quarters, a chance to prove their worth. This would include, the subcommittee said, providing enough well trained social workers to do the job for which juvenile courts were designed.

10. Getting children out of common jails.

11. Better cooperation among the various agencies, national and local, concerned with juvenile delinquency.

12. New laws against trafficking in narcotics and adoptions.

13. Codification of Federal laws for the treatment of juvenile offenders.

All those suggestions or recommendations, as I have read them in brief, were incorporated in detail in the subcommittee's report.

What do we find, Mr. President? After the subcommittee and its predecessors spent more than a year and one-half in making these studies, we now find that the Judiciary Committee wishes to continue the subcommittee.

I should like to read for the RECORD a brief article which appeared at the time the subcommittee was organized:

KILGORE GETS PLACE KEFAUVER WANTED

Senate Judiciary Chairman HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democrat of West Virginia, yesterday took over control of that group's Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, edging out Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, who was eager to get the post.

There have been recurring reports—and recurring denials—that Senate Democratic leaders were eager to keep KEFAUVER out of that potential headline-getting post, which could serve as a build-up for the 1956 Presidential campaign.

A KEFAUVER associate said yesterday, however, that he had seen no evidence of any "ganging up" by the Democratic leadership to keep the Senator out of that job. Associates did not deny, however, that KEFAUVER, a leading critic of "power monopolies," was anxious to head the subcommittee.

KEFAUVER will be second-ranking member on the antitrust unit, which also includes Senators THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Democrat, of Missouri; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming; ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin; WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota; and EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois.

KEFAUVER drew the chairmanships of the subcommittees on Juvenile Delinquency, and Constitutional Amendments.

Just listen to that, Mr. President—as though the Juveline Delinquency Subcommittee were a permanent subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. Mr. President, that is going the limit.

Because of the delay in reporting the resolutions from the Judiciary Committee, I was in hope that the new chairman of the committee would make a study of this entire matter and would try to eliminate a good deal of the expense. But what do we find? As I have already stated today, the chairman of the committee has come forth with proposals which will make available to the Judiciary Committee in excess of $1 million for its operations. I say that is wrong. It is money wasted. Something should be done about it. I am pleading with the Senate to do something about it today.

Mr. President, I contend that to date we have had sufficient hearings on the problem of juvenile delinquency. The subcommittee spent $44,000 in 1953, and $175,000 in 1954; and now it wishes to have an additional $154,000 to do more work in that field, notwithstanding the fact that the subcommittee has already made abundant recommendations about what should be done in order to assist in the fight against this evil of child delinquency.

It strikes me that what ought to be done by those who are interested, particularly by Senators who served on that committee—and I am sure the Senator from Tennessee is familiar with the report, because he was a member of the committee—is to consider the report, and perhaps implement it with legislation, if that should be done. However, nothing further can be gained, by giving the committee $154,000 more to parade all over the country seeking information which it already has in its files. To my way of thinking that is a pure waste of money, and it ought to be stopped.

As I previously indicated, a great many subjects are considered in the report. With respect to Indian juvenile delinquency there are 1½ pages of recommendations; two pages of recommendations with respect to runaway children; recommendations of 3 or 4 pages on the subject of narcotics; 3 or 4 pages on the subject of lewd literature. There are family support recommendations, recommendations with respect to juveniles in the Armed Forces, youth delinquency in public housing, juvenile delinquency in the District of Columbia, and so forth. I do not know of any facet of juvenile delinquency which has not been covered by the subcommittee. Why should we vote to give the subcommittee $150,000 more to permit it to continue to hold hearings when all it could do would be to again parade around the country and spend the taxpayers' money?

Of course, it is possible to dramatize some of this evil. Television and radio are great media for dramatizing the problem of juvenile delinquency. If I fail in trying to persuade the Senate to vote outright against this resolution, I shall certainly seek to reduce the appropriation by a considerable amount, because, as I previously stated, the only thing left to be done is to dramatize the problem. When I sought to reduce the appropriation for 1954 I presented facts and figures to show that it would require less than half of what was then being asked for the dramatization I have referred to. I submit that a similar situation exists today. We should learn by experience.

As each resolution comes up, Mr. President, I plan to ask a few questions regarding the amount of money which it is proposed to appropriate.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that there has been some discussion in relation to the funds desired for juvenile delinquency investigations. On March 5, I was unable to appear to testify before the subcommittee which was making up the budget for that appropriation.

I personally feel that the allocation of funds proposed in the resolution is very sound and in the public interest. Few problems, in my opinion, are more disturbing to the average American than those affecting our youngsters, many of whom are committing crimes. One million youngsters in this country might very well be saved if the hearts and souls of America were put into the fight.

The committee which is to take charge of this investigation will have the benefit of a certain momentum already created. We have learned from past experience that congressional committees create a certain public momentum, but even that momentum dies when the investigation expires.

My view is that in the attack against juvenile delinquency this momentum must not be lost. The various remedial measures which have been begun in the States, and at the Federal level, should be vigorously pursued. The existence of the committee for the duration of this year and the first month of 1956 is, in my opinion, absolutely vital, not only to protect the lives of youngsters, but to protect the Government. These youngsters will take over the Government in the future. This will be their Government. The lives we save may mean the saving of the Nation.

I am sure that Senators recognize, from their own experience, that there are many pitfalls along life's highway. I know of no greater function of the legislative branch than the investigation function when it is nobly undertaken and performed.

I wish to add my voice in urging approval of the appropriation for this particular committee.

HIGHWAY BUILDING PROGRAMS

Mr. SYMINGTON obtained the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was hoping we might bring the pending resolution to a vote. Most of the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] have been on the resolution dealing with juvenile delinquency. That is not the one which is now pending. It is coming up later. I was hopeful that we might dispose of the pending resolution.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to make a few comments on another subject.

Mr. President, knowing of the great interest in the various highway building programs now being studied by the appropriate committees in the House and the Senate, I wish to read to the Senate a letter just received from a man whose support and leadership for better roads is of long standing, Missouri's No. 1 citizen, a former Member of this body and one of our greatest Presidents, Hon. Harry S. Truman:

MY DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: In that you are on the Public Roads Subcommittee, I am writing you my views on the improvement and modernization of the highways of the United States.

My interest in transportation and communication is as lively as it ever was, so that I have noted with approval the consideration being given the bills pending in the Congress to modernize our major highways within 10 years. I repeat, I have a very great interest in transportation and communication.

Every citizen agrees with me that the need to bring our roads and streets up-to-date is urgent. The longer we wait, the greater the cost will be.

Every year our outdated and wornout roads cost us time and money; and, much more important, they cost us lives. Traffic accidents and road congestion together cost us billions of dollars and thousands of lives every year.

I have always been interested in traffic safety. In 1946 I called a National Safety Conference to try to find a way to stop death and destruction by highway accidents. Safety conferences were held yearly on the call of the President after the first one.

Since returning to Missouri, I have been saddened by the number of people who die, every year, on the highways of this great State.

We all know that roads properly built to meet modern highway traffic conditions can help materially to reduce accidents. The saving of life and limb alone would justify the cost of modernizing our road system as quickly as possible.

Of course, it will take a big capital outlay to build a modern highway system. Solutions to fiscal problems are never easy, but I am sure we can all see the wisdom of this investment in the future of this great country. It is one that will bring immediate dividends in the convenience, efficiency and, above all, safety to highway travel and transportation.

Our improved standard of living and vast economic expansion, which accompanied the tremendous growth of highway transportation over the past 40 years are due in large part to the Federal-aid program first enacted in 1916, under a Democratic administration and subsequently extended and enlarged, always on a public service and not on a partisan basis.

The 84th Congress will have few better opportunities to advance the welfare of the American people than by making possible the large scale and rapid development of our highway system. I hope the Congress will take advantage of this opportunity.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Because he made so many other contributions to our Nation and to the free world, history probably will not list Harry S. Truman as a great road builder, but that is the field of public service in which he first earned State, national, and international recognition.

For reasons so adequately stated in his letter, Mr. Truman knows from first hand experience that money spent wisely for roads and highways is not an expense, but one of the best investments that can be made.

In the years from 1927 to 1934, as presiding judge of the county court, the chief administrative office of Jackson County, Mo., Mr. Truman initiated and carried through to successful completion a road system equaled by not more than 1 or 2 other counties in the United States.

Under Judge Truman's leadership, Jackson County was literally taken out of the mud.

An all-weather road served every farm, and no farm was more than 2 miles from a concrete highway—an almost unbelievable achievement 25 years ago.

Building highways was not a matter of partisan politics to Mr. Truman. He retained the best professional staff available under a bipartisan board of engineers. Contracts were let through true competitive bidding to the lowest and best bidders.

Mr. Truman's vision and leadership of 25 years ago resulted in much more rapid development of the rural areas of this county than would otherwise have been possible.

As our former President drives, each day, over these roads from his home in Independence, to his office in Kansas City, to the family farm near Grandview, I am sure he takes justifiable pride in the fact that these roads were the best investment, dollar for dollar, ever made by his county, and that the roads have long since paid for themselves in increased wealth in the area they serve.

Mr. Truman's interest in good roads extended far beyond his home county. Even before he became United States Senator, while still a county judge, he was elected president of a national road association. As shown by his letter read here this afternoon, his support for good roads and highways is unabated. He still believes in building not only for the present but for the future. Would that we had more leaders with such vision and courage.

Mr. GORE subsequently said: Mr. President, I was glad to hear the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri read the letter from former President Harry Truman, who has contributed so much to the cause of good roads. It is particularly fitting that we should receive a message from him in that cause. The Subcommittee on Roads is holding long hearings. We hope we are beginning to see the end of the hearings. I think I can say to the Senate with assurance that it will receive from the Committee on Public Works a good road bill, representing the composite views of the committee, a bill of which the Senate may be proud.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I made this morning before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Public Works Committee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

I appreciate very much the invitation of this committee to appear before you with respect to S. 1160.

I know of no more important legislation now pending in this Congress.

Permit me to say at the beginning of my remarks that I have spent a good portion of my life working for sound expansion of highways. In 1915 I went to the State Senate of Virginia, where I served for 10 years. I became Chairman of the Virginia Senate Road Committee. I was a patron of the bill to establish the first State highway system in Virginia, and introduced a bill providing for a 3-cent gasoline tax, which was, at that time, the highest gasoline tax imposed by any State.

As Governor of Virginia one of my major efforts was to improve our road system. Virginia is a pay-as-you-go road State. Not a single road bond has been issued by the State since 1835. Virginia is 1 of the 4 States of the Union which construct and maintain every public road in the State, thus relieving the localities of all road expense. This has been done from revenue derived from the gasoline tax and license tax. Our present tax is 6 cents for gasoline and $10.00 for license. Our road system in Virginia is creditable, and the Federal records show that of the 54,240 miles in the State highway system, all except 2,942 miles are surfaced.

I am fully conscious of the need for a greatly accelerated road program to meet the new conditions of travel. I am not before your committee today in a spirit of criticism of highway improvement, except to point out what to me appears to be the errors of the pending legislation. I am prepared to support sound measures to modernize our road systems. Furthermore, I would like to say that the pending road bill treats Virginia fairly. The National Highway program as set forth under Senate bill 1160 allots Virginia 908 miles, somewhat more than an average State.

I want to make it very clear that my objections to Senate bill 1160 do not come from either a lack of appreciation of the need for very substantial sums for road improvement or any feeling that the program as such does not deal fairly with Virginia. My objections are based on fundamental reasons why I am convinced that S. 1160 is unsound and unwise in its present form.

The policy for modern highway development was established with the adoption of the Federal Aid Road Act of 1916.

This act recognized the need for highways to carry motor vehicle traffic smoothly across State lines, but it clearly recognized that highway accommodation to communities and people within the States is of equal if not overriding, importance. There is no such thing as a purely interstate road. All highways must serve local as well as interstate traffic.

The wisdom and proof of this policy has been established by nearly 40 years of State-Federal cooperation in highway construction, maintenance, and policing.

The tenets of this policy have been built into our governmental system, our revenue system, our transportation system, and our economic system.

Since Congress first began appropriating to highways in 1916, the funds have been used in cooperation with the States on a matching basis. This bill proposes that the Federal Government pay virtually 100 percent of the interstate system cost.

Throughout all these 39 years to date, basic highway controls have remained in the States, and in Congress the Federal policy has been subject to at least biennial review by the Congress.

To date every dollar of the $13 billion of Federal appropriations, so far made for roads, has been subject to statutory review in authorization legislation, budgetary control, appropriation procedure, and all of it has been paid out of general revenue as expenditures within application of the Federal statutory debt limit.

Over the same period the States and localities have spent close to $80 billion.

From these figures it is seen that in 39 years, nearly half of which have been depression and war periods, the States and the Federal Government have spent $90 billion to $95 billion for highway construction.

I mention these facts simply to indicate that our present policy is capable of producing not only expansion, but also improvement in other aspects of the problem.

It is my own opinion that the present situation does not justify the violent departures from fiscal fundamentals and our traditional principles of government proposed in this administration bill.

Senate bill 1160 will, if adopted, change drastically the methods of road construction, both with State funds and with Federal funds. The range of implications in this legislation is extensive.

1. In my judgment, if Senate bill 1160 is enacted in its present form, it will destroy sound budgetary procedure and take the longest step yet toward concentrating power in the Federal Government.

2. It abolishes the State matching formula, which has existed since 1916. It turns over to the Federal Government control of 40,000 miles of our most important roads heretofore under the control of the 48 States.

3. It gives to certain States large windfall refunds for existing roads which will be refunded to the States on a basis that will result in great injustice as between them.

4. It is based upon the erroneous conclusion that the interstate system as established by this bill will meet the needs for a period of 32 years. It would dry up the gasoline tax for road improvement on this system from 1966 to 1987 in order to pay the bonds and the interest thereon. It apparently assumes that no new road development on the interstate system will be necessary in this 22-year period.

5. It establishes a Government corporation without income or assets and authorizes this corporation to borrow $21 billion for 32 years without declaring it as a debt, and by legerdemain excludes this debt from the debt limitation fixed by Congress. The interest will be $11.5 billions, or 55 percent of the funds borrowed.

6. It provides for payment of principal and interest on these bonds with permanent indefinite appropriations, which removes the corporation from annual appropriation control by Congress.

7. It gives the corporation authority to draw from the Treasury at any time during the next 32 years additional amounts up to $5 billion outstanding at one time without going through any appropriation action by Congress.

8. It attempts to convert what was originally intended to be a temporary excise tax on gasoline for general revenue purposes into a permanent special tax, irrevocably dedicated to a single specified purpose.

It is to me fantastic to think that in this 22-year period there will be no need for road development. The construction of roads is a continuing process. A secondary road today may be an interstate road tomorrow and vice versa. Requirements for roads never stand still.

A superficial glance at the map of this interstate system makes it absurd to think 40,000 miles will be the ironbound limit over the period of 32 years. I suspect the mileage will be increased quickly when it is found that the system bypasses the capitals of six States and many important areas are omitted.

This Federal corporation will borrow money for roads outside the Federal debt limit and spend it without regard to budgetary control and appropriation procedure. Should this be approved, it will certainly be followed by other proposals to finance endless outlays in a similar manner. If a dummy corporation can be established by Congress to borrow $21 billion for roads, and this corporation has neither assets nor income, then why cannot other corporations be established to feed on dedicated liquor taxes or the cigarette taxes and scores of other taxes now being levied by the Federal Government.

Returning to the methods, procedures, and techniques proposed to finance this $25 billion road corporation, it is my sincere conviction that the proposal is incapable of honest Federal bookkeeping and accounting. It contemplates a dual set of books. In one, the ordinary operations of Government subject to debt, budgetary, and appropriation control will be disclosed. In the other the extraordinary functions of the Government, as set forth in this legislation, with special privileges to evade sound financing requirements, will be concealed.

In these days when we are continuously piling up debt to be paid by our children and grandchildren, the least we can do is to keep the books honest and make full disclosure of the obligations we are incurring.

There probably was never a corporation—public or private—with assets so small and liabilities so large as proposed in Senate bill 1160. Neither it nor the Federal Government will even own the rights-of-way or the roadbeds on which the money is to be spent.

We must remember that we cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain, nor can we evade debt by definition. The earmarking of a tax over a long period of years is of very questionable legality and, in my judgment, even if legal, it is poor practice. Whenever you begin to earmark taxes out of the general revenue, then such a practice will be continued for other purposes and thereby the authority of Congress over appropriations would be destroyed.

I have sought an opinion from Mr. John Simms, Chief of the Senate Legislative Counsel, as to the legality of earmarking future proceeds from a specific tax for the payment of a debt created by a Government corporation. Here are the questions I propounded:

1. Prior to the time all obligations of the corporation have been retired, can the Congress reduce or repeal the taxes imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and thus eliminate the base for computing the permanent indefinite appropriation?

2. Prior to the time all obligations of the corporation have been retired, can Congress reduce or repeal the permanent appropriation provided in section 105 (b)?

ANSWER BY JOHN H. SIMMS

"It seems elementary that one Congress, or one law enacted by a Congress, cannot completely foreclose action by a subsequent Congress, or by a subsequent law of the same Congress. To so hold would be to say that once a policy had been enunciated by the Congress it is not susceptible to change. That is not to say, however, that a subsequent Congress is always left with an unlimited realm of action. Rights may have accrued under a law which cannot be validly divested. But the power of each Congress to enact legislation for future application cannot be eliminated by action of a prior Congress. A change of policy by a Congress, effected by amending or repealing previously enacted laws, may give rise to causes of action by persons whose vested rights are thereby adversely affected, but unless the policy change is invalid in all aspects, the power of the Congress to make the change is not destroyed by previous enactments. For example, the next Congress could reduce the amount of indebtedness which the Corporation is authorized to incur, or could provide a different method of financing with respect to obligations subsequently issued by the Corporation.

"It should be noted that the bill does not appropriate the moneys in excess of $622,500,000 collected under sections 4081 and 4041 of the 1954 Code, but an amount equal to the moneys collected in excess of such amount. While the obvious purpose is to earmark these revenue collections, the bill does not attempt to prescribe the tax rates under these sections of the 1954 Code nor to foreclose a change in the rates.

"The statement in section 2 of the bill can be taken as no more than a statement of policy by the present Congress, in fact, only of the present Congress at the time this bill is enacted. Each Congress has power to make changes in the tax laws which it deems desirable. Likewise, each Congress has power to appropriate such moneys as it deems desirable to provide for the operation of the Government and to satisfy the debts of the United States.

"The answers to these two questions are in the affirmative. Each Congress has power to repeal or reduce, at any time, the taxes imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code and to reduce or repeal, at any time, the permanent appropriation made by section 105 (b) of the bill. For the same reasons, the Congress could not be compelled to increase the amount of the permanent appropriation should it prove insufficient to meet the debt service requirements of the corporation."

So it is very evident that the gasoline tax cannot be legally earmarked over a period of years, nor can permanent appropriations be made beyond the power of Congress to change them, with the definite result that the proceeds of this tax can be made available to pay off these bonds and the interest.

Camouflage it all you please, the bonds issued by this corporation will be a Federal debt, and a general obligation of the Government. It would be absurd for this corporation to attempt to issue bonds unless the Federal Government would guarantee them for the simple reason that unless this were so the bonds would be unsaleable. Those who buy bonds by the billions of dollars in value do not do so unless their validity and security are assured.

I point now to one glaring inconsistency in this bill, and that is that while one clause of the bill states the bonds are not guaranteed by the Federal Government, there is another provision that gives the Government the right to sell these bonds to Government-trust funds.

It is unthinkable to me that the Congress would authorize legislation to permit bonds not guaranteed by the Federal Government to be sold to its trust funds, such as the social security for which the Government is a trustee with all of the responsibility that a trusteeship carries.

It is idle, I think, to take time to discuss the question whether this is a legal debt of the United States Government. If it is not a legal debt the whole enterprise will fall because the bonds simply cannot be sold.

Here is an opinion by the Comptroller General of the United States holding that the bonds would be a legal debt of the Government—that the bonds will not be self-liquidating, and the funds for paying off the bonds would have to come from the general fund of the Treasury:

FEBRUARY 17, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In response to your request of February 11, 1955, attached herewith is a condensed summary of the methods used to finance the activities of the various Federal corporations now in existence and

certain other agencies engaged in business-type activities. Also, as requested, there is attached as a separate memorandum a more detailed summary of the financing arrangements of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

You also inquired as to whether or not the Government has ever used a financing arrangement such as is proposed by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program in its report of January. That proposal called for the creation of a new Government corporation to be known as the Federal Highway Corporation and an authorization for it to issue bonds in an amount sufficient to cover the Federal share of the cost of constructing the proposed interstate system of roads over a construction period of 10 years.

While the terms and conditions of the Corporation's bonds would be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and the plan calls for their repayment from funds provided by the Treasury as authorized by the Congress annually (presumably by appropriation action), the plan does not specifically provide that such bonds be guaranteed by the Secretary of the Treasury. However, all related factors plus the fact that they are to be issued by a Federal corporation would have the same effect. The total amount of such borrowings from the public would amount to $25 billion. The Corporation's activities would not be self-liquidating, it would have no important revenues, and funds for paying off the bonds would have to come from the general funds of the Treasury.

Insofar as we are aware, such a financing arrangement for a Federal expenditure program of the scale and magnitude contemplated for the proposed Federal Highway Corporation has never been used by the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

It is obvious to me that this Corporation will have supreme power over the construction, the operation, and everything else in connection with the 40,000 miles of interstate road. The authority of the States will be clearly abdicated. The legislation specifically provides that in cases of dispute between States and Federal authorities, the Corporation will decide in the nature of a supreme court. This absolute final Federal authority over the vital roads in all the States is a very serious matter.

This program envisages right-of-way of up to 255 feet and access to the roads will be extremely limited. It is proposed to use existing routes, which have been in long use and naturally, they have accumulated business operations of all kinds. A 255-foot right-of-way will necessitate the removal of thousands and thousands of buildings, or the bypassing of many of these areas. I can appreciate the fact that cities, because of congested traffic, can and should at times be bypassed, but the same conditions do not apply to towns and rural areas.

I have been told by our Virginia State Highway Commission that one of the main routes, from Winchester to Bristol, would have to be relocated, certainly over one-half its length, and this relocation would mean that investments to the extent of millions of dollars along these rights-of-way to service the traveling public would be rendered valueless.

While it is not clearly defined, it is apparently provided that all concessionaires such as restaurants, filling stations, motels, etc., may be licensed and there is indication in the report that license fees will be charged. But, I emphasize that whatever may be said today as to the powers of this highway corporation, such powers would be virtually unlimited. They can move the roadbed. They can establish a license system for all concessions and charge fees, or anything else they choose to do within the right-of-way limit.

To those who deny this, I would like to ask: Where are the safeguards in this legislation to prevent the Federal Government from exercising this conclusive and dictatorial control if it chooses to do it?

I want to make clear also that this legislation will be permanent. There is no recovery of the power we would be giving away over our roads and the activities that exist along these roads.

I have searched the records and nothing comparable to this legislation, in its magnitude, has ever been suggested in the way of increasing the concentration of power at Washington.

I call to the attention of the committee the language of section 207B on page 20 of the bill.

This provides that for toll roads completed prior to December 31, 1951, within the interstate system there shall be allowed as a credit to the State an amount not exceeding 40 percent of the original cost. For toll roads completed during the period between December 31, 1951, and December 31, 1955, the State will receive a credit not exceeding 70 percent of the original cost. For a toll highway constructed after December 31, 1955, the State will receive 90 percent of the cost of construction.

It is difficult to determine from the report the extent of these refunds, but in my opinion, they will certainly run into many billions of dollars.

The report states that on the interstate system there are 1,058 miles of toll roads now in operation, and the refund formula will be from 40 to 70 percent of cost of the roads taken into the system.

The report states there are 1,247 miles under construction or financed. It is likely that these roads which go into the system will certainly receive either 70 or 90 percent credit.

The report then states there are 3,854 miles authorized, and this category will receive credit of either 70 or 90 percent.

The report lists additional proposals of 3,578 miles, and in this category the refunds to the States will certainly be 90 percent.

As toll roads are costing on an average of $1 million a mile, this will involve refunds on a basis of an approximate cost of $8.5 billion.

But the bill goes further. Section 207C is an invitation to every State to construct more and more toll roads on the interstate system, which will not be paid for out of State funds but by revenue bonds secured on the revenue of the turnpike. The State will then receive 90 percent of the cost of these roads built any time in the future—now or 10 years from now—all such refunds to be expended outside of the interstate system without matching.

When the State receives this refund, it can decide whether to pay off the revenue bonds and free the roads of tolls, or use the money, without matching, on other roads. The decision, in my opinion, will be unanimous not to pay the revenue bonds off on the toll roads, but to use the money for other construction.

I agree with the American Automobile Association when it called these refunds "a reimbursement bonanza" which would practically force the States to go into the toll business.

No one can predict the amount of refunds under this section in the years to come, but it is obvious that they will be great and concentrated in certain States. This will bring about an unequal distribution of the Federal funds to States that have constructed toll roads.

In addition to these refunds I have mentioned, it is further provided that any freeways constructed by any State that comply with standards set forth in the bill can likewise receive refunds.

When it is considered that $21 billion is to be borrowed; interest will be $11.5 billion; and that there will be billions of dollars in refunds, as permitted under this legislation, we must conclude the actual funds to be expended on new construction will be greatly diminished.

In my opinion, the refund provision is one of the more iniquitous provisions of this legislation, and it is especially indefensible because those testifying in favor of the bill have not been able to estimate the amount of refunds.

In conclusion, I want to express my support of a sound pay-as-you-go plan of road improvement. The request has frequently been made by the governors of the States that the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax be repealed. This is certainly one way greatly to promote the road program. Should it be repealed, and the present Federal aid to States be continued, amounting to $525 million a year over the period of the life of this program, there would be a far greater sum available for road improvement than under the plan proposed in this bill.

A continued direct appropriation of $525 million annually out of the Federal Treasury, and the reimposition by the States of the 2-cent gasoline tax, if removed by the Federal Government, will bring in an additional revenue of $39 billion to the States during the 32-year period if the estimates of the President's Advisory Committee are correct.

I do not think there is a single State in the Union that would not be ready to reimpose the 2-cent tax after the repeal of this tax by the Federal Government.

I suggest as one solution of the problem that:

1. The 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it.

2. Present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems which, for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the long standing match basis. This amounts to $535 million a year.

3. The lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

Under such a plan States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad the Senator from Missouri has read the letter dealing with the activities of former President Truman pertaining to roads. I believe Congress is still pursuing the idea former President Truman had in mind when he was building roads in Jackson County. In giving credit where credit is due, I believe that credit should be given, even at this late date, to a man who back in the year 1916 represented the State of Arizona in the House of Representatives. If we are to give credit to the men who got America out of the mud, let us give credit to the Senator who sits on my right, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He is the father of roads in this country. He was the initiator of the original bill. He made it possible for the Committee on Public Works, of which I am now chairman, and the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], to continue our work.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I believe that credit should also be given to former Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, who was the right hand man of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in the matter of building roads in America.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from North Dakota is absolutely correct. In the early days when one had to face stern realities, it was the old timers, such men as Senator HAYDEN and former Senator McKellar, who did the real work. I wish to give credit to Senator HAYDEN for getting us out of the mud. To him the United States of America owes a great deal.

Mr. President, I desire now to turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

COMMERCIAL AIR SERVICE BETWEEN NEW YORK CITY AND MEXICO CITY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it was not my intention this afternoon to discuss in detail the subject I have in mind, but I wish to say a few words on it. Uncle Sam is the easiest victim of foreign ideas and of foreign powers that anyone can think of. I wish to discuss briefly the question of air flights from New York City to Mexico City. Senators know that it is not possible to fly direct in an American airplane from New York to Mexico City; but do they know that it is not possible to board an American airplane in Mexico City and ride nonstop to New York City? Let me tell the Senate what the situation is. I hold in my hand a recent news report. It is quoted from the American Aviation Daily of March 3, 1955.

Senators like to boast about being Americans. I ask them to listen to this:

> During its first year of operation with traffic rights between New York and Mexico City (through Jan. 14, 1955), Air France—

This is not Eastern Air Lines or American Air Lines or Pan American Airways, or TWA, but Air France—

> carried 26,000 passengers between the two cities. It offered 80,960,000-passenger miles, and sold 68,350,000, corresponding to an average load factor of 82 percent.

I have been at the airport in Mexico City, and I know what I am talking about. I have seen the situation. I have seen an American plane take off with 18 passengers, and I have seen Air France airplanes take off loaded to full capacity.

The article states that Air France has just finished a good year in operating between New York and Mexico City. It carried 26,000 passengers between the 2 cities, for a total of 63,350,000 passenger miles.

Mr. President, I am not talking about flying from Paris to Mexico City. I am not talking about flying from a French colonial possession in North Africa to Mexico City. I am talking about flying from an American city to Mexico City.

That is fine for Air France, Mr. President. Behind this news clipping lies an extraordinary story of bungling by someone in the United States Government. It is not right. It is not fair. Senators who are about to vote more than a million dollars for an investigation, certainly must be interested in the taxpayers' dollar.

While this French airline has a large and profitable business between New York City and Mexico City, the United States-flag airline with a New York-Mexico City route is losing money on its Mexican service.

The reason is that the United States airline is not permitted—not by France, but by its own Government—to operate nonstop between New York City and Mexico City.

Do Senators realize the impact of such a situation? A passenger can board a foreign airline plane in New York and fly nonstop to Mexico City. Those flights are paid for with American dollars. That cannot be done on an American plane. The reason is that the United States airline is not permitted by our own Government to operate nonstop between New York City and Mexico City. That right has been given by our Government to the French carrier. That is my complaint.

What the airlines need is competition. If I have a ship and another man has a ship, we should be permitted to take on passengers, in competition with each other, with the idea that the best man will win in going after the business. That is good old American competition.

But now an American airline is not permitted to fly nonstop to Mexico City, while at the same time Uncle Sam gives a foreign airline permission to do just that. The United States carrier has to stop all its flights at Dallas and Fort Worth, while the French carrier is permitted to fly nonstop directly to Mexico City.

One result of this discrimination against the United States-flag service is that it takes at least 25 percent more time to make a round trip between New York and Mexico City on a United States flag carrier than it does by Air France. Naturally, the bulk of the passengers between New York and Mexico are now flying in the French planes.

How did this amazing situation arise? Why does this Nation discriminate against United States air transportation in favor of French airlines?

The answer to this question is certainly not to be found in the record of the pioneering of this service by the French. They did not pioneer. I recall years and years ago when our airlines in Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico were trying to start a new business and bring about a new transportation situation. They were the ones who pioneered as far back as 1942 to 1945. I am proud of the fact that I contributed a little to get American Airlines into Mexico City.

The French are newcomers. The service was pioneered and developed under the United States flag. American Airlines has been operating between New York and Mexico City since 1942. It is not a "Johnny-come-lately." It built its air service to Mexico literally from scratch. Those boys were poor. They were pioneering, as our ancestors pioneered in the West. The company had to construct a complete airway system with landing fields, emergency fields, ground installations, and radar stations, before it could even get started.

I recall to this day that at Monterey, Mexico, where General Taylor, of blessed memory, in the Mexican War made his name great, American Airlines, not Air France, with their own money, their own technique, and their own know-how, built an airport. The company had to do it at its own expense, in sharp contrast to the situation where the Government builds the airways, and in even sharper contrast to the situation which confronted Air France when it entered the New York-Mexico City market a little over a year ago, after the airway system was built.

Nor did our Government subsidize American Airlines. No one subsidized American Airlines. C. R. Smith and Red Mosher, and a number of other men in the West pioneered.

Its Mexican service has been operated continuously without subsidy even though on this route it has suffered operating losses which, on a cumulative basis, are now more than three-quarters of a million dollars. The New York-Mexico City traffic is the largest single source of revenue on this route.

When our Government authorized this United States service to Mexico it was required that every flight stop at Dallas-Fort Worth. Of course, at that time airplanes did not have the range which they now have. They could not have flown the distance between New York and Mexico City nonstop. So the required intermediate stop made no particular difference.

But with the great new modern aircraft such a nonstop operation became feasible, and as early as 1947—8 years ago—American Airlines applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for authority to operate nonstop between New York and Mexico City.

But the Civil Aeronautics Board sat on that application, refused to grant a hearing, and did nothing until last year, 7 years after the application was filed. Then it finally started a proceeding which has not yet been concluded. After 7 years, the Board is beginning to look into the matter, and eventually it may make a decision.

In the meantime, our Government dealt very differently with Air France. I want Senators to get mad about it; I really do.

In July of 1951 Air France filed an application for nonstop flights between New York and Mexico City. This was 4 years after American Airlines had filed its application. But within 6 months the Civil Aeronautics Board had completed its procedures on the Air France application and had authorized Air France to operate nonstop between New York and Mexico City. In spite of that action, the Civil Aeronautics Board still sat on the application of American Airlines for the same service and did absolutely nothing for our own carrier.

Mr. President, someone might refer to me as an isolationist. It is not my intention to be, but when the showdown comes, believe me, I shall pick Uncle Sam every time. I cannot see any reason why our Government should discriminate in

favor of a foreign airline as against a pioneering airline of our own country.

It was not until January of 1954 that Air France was able to institute its New York-Mexico City service, because it was not until then that it received permission from the Mexican Government. In January of 1954 it did get permission and promptly began to carry traffic nonstop between New York and Mexico City.

Obviously, this gave a tremendous competitive advantage to the French airline. The United States airline, which had developed that traffic, was now compelled to fight for it with one hand tied behind its back. The result was exactly what might have been expected. The Air France operation was quickly increased to a daily service and the great time advantage which it enjoyed because of its nonstop rights enabled it almost immediately to capture most of the traffic.

Do Senators know who travel from New York to Mexico City on the French planes? American citizens. As I stated before, the service is paid for by American dollars. At this time the French airline carries nearly 4 times as many passengers as does the United States airline which spent 12 years building up the traffic before Air France ever began.

When the Air France operation was started, our Government finally began to move. The State Department recommended to the Civil Aeronautics Board that prompt action be taken to correct the competitive inequality, and at last the Civil Aeronautics Board began a proceeding on the American Airlines' application which it had been sitting on for 7 long years.

Talk about our friend from Kansas who spoke about the Democrats being in office for 4 long years? This is 7 long years.

In fairness to the Civil Aeronautics Board it should be pointed out that when it finally took action it tried to move promptly and it issued an exemption to permit American Airlines to begin nonstop operations immediately, to compete with Air France, pending the hearing on American's application. The Mexican Government, however, insisted that a similar right should be given a Mexican carrier and therefore refused to join in the immediate temporary authorization for American Airlines, so the Civil Aeronautics Board withdrew its temporary exemption.

The Civil Aeronautics Board then went ahead with its proceeding. Two other United States carriers entered the proceeding. These two were Eastern Air Lines and Pan American Airways who for many years had been providing a service between New York and Mexico City by connection at Houston.

Eastern Airlines flies to Houston; there it connects with Pan-American Airlines, which flies into Mexico City.

After months of delay a hearing was finally held before a CAB examiner in November of 1954 on the application of American Airlines, which by that time had been pending for 7½ years, and on the more recent applications filed by Eastern and Pan-American. The case is now being considered by the examiner, a Government employee, for whose salary Congress will be appropriating money one of these days.

But even after he makes his initial decision there will be further delay while the CAB reviews the examiner's decision and then submits the case to the President for his final determination. Therefore, while it can be hoped and expected that the case will now move speedily, it is clear that Air France will continue to enjoy its great competitive advantage over United States air transportation for several months more.

If the case moves with dispatch this gross discrimination by our own Government against United States flag air transportation will, of course, finally be corrected. It is high time that corrective action be taken. With nothing done for 7 years for our own carriers despite action taken for the benefit of the French in 6 short months, and with 8 years now having elapsed since the first application was filed by a United States carrier, the record of delay is one which our Government certainly cannot be proud of.

I hope the Government is not proud of it. It is not fair; it is not right.

Congress enacts tax laws and expects the Government to collect taxes. How do we expect Americans operating American companies to pay taxes if we prefer a foreign airline to an American airline, or if we do not permit, at least, keen competition?

It is impossible to understand how this state of affairs could ever have been permitted to arise. New York is more than 3,500 miles from France and Mexico City is an additional 2,000 miles away. The interest of the United States in traffic between New York and Mexico City on the other hand is the most direct interest conceivable. Not only has the traffic been pioneered and developed by United States air transportation, but the overwhelming majority of the passengers traveling between these cities are United States citizens. It is inconceivable that our Government could have an aviation policy which in the Western Hemisphere would discriminate in favor of a European airline and against our own airlines in the transportation of our own citizens. There is not another country on earth that would permit any such situation to arise or that would tolerate for one day such a gross discrimination against its own citizens.

I do not charge our Government with deliberately bringing about this state of affairs. I am sure that it is simply a case of bad bungling somewhere along the way. Yet I would suppose that in the course of 8 long years, during 7 of which our Government refused even to grant a hearing on an application filed by a United States airline, the bungling could have been corrected.

How this kind of thing can be prevented in the future I do not know. Perhaps there is too much opportunity for buck passing under the present division of responsibilities between the Civil Aeronautics Board, the State Department, and the White House in these international route matters. But whatever the trouble may be, it is clear that there has been a lack of vigor in protecting the United States and in moving speedily and directly to dispose of business pending entirely too long a time. Let us hope that the lack of vigor and the delays are matters of history and will not be repeated.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FURTHER EXPENDITURES AND TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 57) authorizing further expenditures and temporary employment of additional assistants by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I ask the Senator from Alabama if this is the same committee which investigated housing last year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is the Committee on Banking and Currency. The committee which investigated housing last year was the full Committee on Banking and Currency, and the investigation will again be carried on by that committee. It is not a special committee in any sense of the word.

It is the plan of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], to use the Subcommittee on Housing for the purpose of the investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean to carry on the work of the subcommittee in respect to investigations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the subcommittee was organized in 1954.

Mr. SPARKMAN. An authorization and an appropriation were made in 1954 to enable the committee to conduct an investigation of the Federal Housing Administration. That investigation was made. We intend to carry on the investigation, but we intend to do something else, namely, to make a continuing study, which I think is contemplated by the Reorganization Act of 1946, of the whole field of housing, which, after all, is one of the biggest programs in which the Federal Government engages.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that Senate Resolution 229, of the 83d Congress, appropriated $150,000 for such purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of that has been used?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry I do not have the figures at my fingertips, but my recollection, which is subject to correction, is that there were two different resolutions. Under both of them a total of $225,000 was appropriated, of which $184,000 was used, if I remember correctly, leaving about $41,000 unexpended. However, that authorization has expired,

and we are not asking for the reappropriation of the balance.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is asking for $100,000 of new money?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; of new money.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the same investigative and clerical force which served the previous subcommittee be used?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In part, but not altogether, because some of the personnel have already resigned and have returned to their former jobs; but we anticipate using personnel whom we hope to obtain from Government agencies on a reimbursable basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice, according to the showing made before the Committee on Rules and Administration, that it is hoped to have sufficient money with which to employ 1 chief counsel, 2 special counsel, and 2 investigators; and then I notice the item "editorial research." This follows the same pattern as is followed by other committees.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is more or less typical nomenclature. Of course, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, in doing work such as this, a great deal of research, such as going back through the records and checking accounts, is required. The preparation of reports is also involved. All these activities are included in that particular nomenclature. But I think the Senator from Louisiana understands that a very general type of work is done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that provision is made for 16 employees. Can the Senator from Alabama state the number of extra employees hired by the standing Committee on Banking and Currency when the investigation of housing was made?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, I am sorry; I cannot. I am certain that it was a greater number than 16. I assure the Senator from Louisiana, and all other Senators, that this study and investigation—and I want to include both terms—will be as economically conducted as that which will be carried on by any other committee of Congress.

After all, this is a tremendous program, under which the Federal Government incurs a liability of something like, offhand, $7.5 billion a year. I think an expenditure of $100,000 for 1 year is a pretty good investment in watching the program. Even though nothing irregular be found, I think the amount asked would be well worthwhile.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 57), as amended, was agreed to.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES RELATING TO INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 52, Senate Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 58) to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds with the consideration of the resolutions reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

Before the Senate proceeds to consider the resolutions which pertain to the Committee on the Judiciary, it seems only proper to bring to the attention of the Senate that each of these resolutions has the unanimous approval of the Committee on the Judiciary and are now before the Senate, having been reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary was increased tremendously, and, in addition to this, the functions formerly performed by the Committee on Claims, the Committee on Immigration, and the Committee on Patents were transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Beginning with the 80th Congress, the number of legislative proposals referred to the Committee has increased with each Congress. During the 80th Congress the Committee received over 1,500 bills and resolutions, which approximated 42 percent of the total legislation received in the Senate. During the 83d Congress the Committee received 3,000 bills and resolutions, which amounted to 49.8 percent of the total legislation received in the Senate.

There was referred to the Committee not only a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than any other standing Committee of the Senate, but of the 2,505 written reports filed with the Senate in the 83d Congress, the Judiciary Committee submitted 1,451 reports, representing 57.9 percent of all written reports filed.

However, these figures in nowise represent the sum total of Committee effort in relation to legislative activity. Committee consideration of many bills often results in adverse action and indefinite postponement, requiring the preparation of written reports on these measures which are not submitted to the Senate.

As can readily be seen, because of the amount of legislation which is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, increasing demands are made for conducting hearings on private relief bills, as well as those of a general nature. Naturally, to comply with such requests consumes time and requires necessary personnel to assist the Committee in processing these measures for consideration by the Committee and the subcommittees thereof.

During the more recent Congresses, the efforts of the committee have been expended on an increasing burden of legislation with respect to judicial proceedings, constitutional amendments, Federal courts and judges, revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, internal security, patents, copyrights and trade-marks, and immigration and naturalization.

Historically, the Congress has logically delegated the initial tasks of legislative preparation and formulation of legislative policy to its standing committees. Adequate professional and clerical assistance to the members of any committee has been demonstrated by experience to be an absolute necessity. The resolutions about to be considered are necessary in order to provide the Committee on the Judiciary and its subcommittees with assistance in carrying out the legislative process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 58) to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, which was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with additional amendments.

The amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, to strike out all after the word *"Resolved"* and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee under S. Res. 366 of the Eighty-first Congress to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution which shall not exceed $260,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

The additional amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, in the amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary, on page 2, line 12, after the word "committee", to strike out "under Senate Resolution 366 of the 81st Congress"; in line 25, after the word "the", to strike out "Internal Security Subcommittee of the", and on page 3, line 1, after the word "Judiciary", to insert "or any subcommittee thereof,", so as to make the resolution read:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee to make a complete and continuing

study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956 (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution which shall not exceed $260,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi a few questions about the resolution. Does it provide for a continuation of the internal security investigation which originated back in 1950?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. The Senate resolution which created the subcommittee was agreed to at that time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that under Senate Resolution 366, of the 81st Congress, $100,000 was asked for; under Senate Resolution 7 of the 82d Congress, $85,000 was requested, and in the second session of the 82d Congress, $95,000 was requested.

Last year, according to the record before me, $170,000 was spent. When that request was made, there was a showing made in the report of how the money was going to be spent and the number of employees who were to be hired.

I am wondering if the Senator from Mississippi will tell us why it is necessary to raise the amount from $170,000 to $260,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. The difference is due to this factor: The total of $221,000 which was available last year for the committee——

Mr. ELLENDER. How much was spent altogether last year?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am informed the amount was $211,000. Does the Senator desire to know the reason——

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to ask why $50,000 more is being requested.

Mr. EASTLAND. Several employees who were doing Internal Security Subcommittee work were on the staff of the Immigration Subcommittee. The chairman of the full committee thought that each subcommittee should have its own employees, with which I agreed, and the employees were transferred to the Internal Security Subcommittee.

There are a number of projects that will be investigated, and that will take more money. In addition, the subcommittee adopted, at the request of the full committee, new rules of procedure. I think it had been advocated pretty generally by the Senate that there should not be hearings unless at least two Senators were present. That necessity requires an increase in funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is that? How will the necessity of having two Senators sit on committees require an increase in funds?

Mr. EASTLAND. Because when hearings are held out of town, 2 Senators instead of 1 will have to go. The committee and the Government Operations Subcommittee have adopted a uniform rule of procedure whereby the minority is to be provided with counsel. Heretofore the minority has not had counsel. Now it is entitled to counsel. Those are the reasons for the request for additional funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the staff, the investigators, the lawyers, and others connected with the investigation, be increased in number?

Mr. EASTLAND. The present staff has places for 28 employees. There are three vacancies on the staff. I expect to cut the staff down somewhat. However, the committee is going to be very effective this year. It is going to be very frugal with its expenditures. It is certainly going to live within the budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent will the Senator cooperate with the House Un-American Activities Committee, as well as the committee headed by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]? I read in the press some time ago that a meeting was held by the chairmen of the various committees, in the hope that something could be done to stop or prevent duplication.

Mr. EASTLAND. There will be no duplication.

Mr. ELLENDER. In view of that fact, is the Senator from Mississippi still of the opinion that he will need all the funds he is requesting?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am positive there will be no waste.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 58), as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing further expenditures relating to the internal security of the United States."

STUDY OF ANTITRUST LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 53, Senate Resolution 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 61) authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 61) authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand from the report which accompanies the resolution, the purpose of creating the subcommittee is to study evidence as well as recommendations which will be made by the Attorney General. It is stated in the report that the subcommittee will be organized in order to make such studies of the report of the Attorney General. I do not suppose anyone is familiar with the contents of the Attorney General's report.

I wonder whether the Senator from West Virginia will be willing to let the resolution remain on the calendar and await the report from the Attorney General. In that way it might be possible for us to determine the amount of work necessary to be done. As I understand, the Attorney General's report may be submitted soon—perhaps next week or next month. It seems to me that we should let the resolution remain on the calendar; and as soon as the report comes to us from the Attorney General, we can then consider the resolution anew.

I may state, Mr. President, that I am informed that a resolution similar to the one the Senate is now considering was before the Judiciary Committee for some time. I have before me a brief memorandum on it. The memorandum states that in the 82d Congress there was a resolution authorizing the appropriation of $250,000 for antitrust investigations. Senator McCarran submitted Senate Resolution 86, to provide funds for a probe similar to the one we are now considering. That resolution was not reported by the Judiciary Committee.

In the 83d Congress, Senate Resolution 14, authorizing a similar study, was submitted, was approved by the committee, and was placed on the calendar; but it was never acted upon.

The resolution we are now discussing would, if agreed to, be the first specifically to provide funds for a full-fledged antitrust probe, although, as I have said before, last year the Judiciary Committee did not suggest the adoption of the resolution, which was then on the calendar.

So I suggest to the Senator from West Virginia that, in light of the fact that the report shows that the subcommittee is being organized primarily for the purpose of studying the recommendations of the Attorney General, we permit the resolution to remain on the calendar and open for further consideration.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Louisiana, let me say the subcommittee is a standing subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. By the Legislative Reorganization Act, there was placed on the Judiciary Committee the duty of going into all antitrust matters. At the last session of Congress, the subcommittee, with volunteer help—because no funds were available—made an investigation of

monopoly aspects in the power field and filed a subcommittee report. I believe the subcommittee had no working funds, and was assisted by a volunteer counsel.

Let me also say there is misapprehension about the recommendations to be submitted by the Attorney General. He appointed a committee—about 60 or 65 in number, I believe—to study the antitrust laws. That was done 2 years ago. The committee recently, so I was informed by the Attorney General, completed a report. I was also informed by a member of the committee that in the report there are some 65 recommendations as to changes in the antitrust laws, and that the report probably within a week will be printed and available for distribution.

That precipitated the necessity for us to have an organization ready to handle the report and the recommendations. Unless we are to accept blindly the recommendations of 60 unpaid, volunteer attorneys, many of whom may represent corporations which may have interests in the monopoly field, we believe it is necessary to study the report as soon as it is off the press. After all, if it took the Attorney General's committee 2 years to make their report, it follows that the recommendations in the report certainly merit a complete study by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I did not interrupt the Senator from Louisiana when he was speaking. So, if he will pardon me, I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator from West Virginia asked me a rather long question, and I should like to answer it.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Louisiana asked me a rather long question also.

Mr. President, that is the occasion at this time for believing it is necessary for us to be ready to deal with this matter. I point out to the Senator from Louisiana that we cannot pick from a shelf, somewhere, the experts who will be needed to study the antitrust laws. It is necessary to employ those who have no ax to grind, and who are experts in the field of antitrust legislation.

Furthermore, a veritable flood of mergers has begun, both in my own State of West Virginia and in many other States. That development is similar to the one which precipitated the 1929 depression, and also is similar to the one which precipitated the panic in 1880.

The Judiciary Committee believes that such a study is necessary; and after studying the proposed budget, the committee approved that budget as necessary, as did the Committee on Rules and Administration.

That is why I do not wish to have the committee wait. Apparently some of the lawyers have been talking about their recommendations, and I have seen résumés of the report in the Wall Street Journal and in other publications. Obviously it is necessary for us to be ready to take action, without waiting 2 years.

The Senator from Louisiana must realize that the Sherman Act has not been reviewed by Congress in 65 years, and the Clayton Act has not been reexamined for a very long time, and the same is true of the Robinson-Patman Act. That is why I believe it is necessary for the committee to commence this work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to read from the report itself the reason advanced for the creation of the subcommittee. I do not object to a study being made of whatever findings the Attorney General may submit. What I am objecting to is the creation of the subcommittee now, in order to study what may come forward 3 or 4 months hence.

I read now from page 2 of the committee's statement:

> Attorney General Brownell recognized the need for a study of the antitrust laws on June 26, 1953, in announcing the appointment of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. The Attorney General's committee is expected to report its recommendations for revision of the antitrust laws to the Congress some time next month. As the Committee on the Judiciary, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies those recommendations will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration. The Committee on the Judiciary will immediately be faced with the task of evaluating and analyzing the recommendations which have occupied the attention of the Attorney General's 60-man committee for almost 2 years. Because of the necessity of reconciling conflicting points of view, extensive and lengthy hearings on these recommendations are contemplated.

Mr. President, I concede that it will be necessary to have special help to make a study of the report, after it comes to the Judiciary Committee. But a subcommittee of this character was suggested several years ago, and was never created, and no money was ever given for it, insofar as the record shows, or insofar as I have been able to ascertain.

All I am requesting is that the resolution remain on the calendar; and as soon as the Attorney General files his report, we shall be able to determine—better than we can now—how much money will be necessary and how many persons may be required to make the study.

If this resolution is agreed to today there is no doubt that the chairman of the committee will appoint the necessary personnel without further ado.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The record should be corrected. It is slightly misleading. The report was dated February 21. It stated that within the next month—which would be March—the recommendations would be published. Since that time the Attorney General has talked with the Senator from West Virginia, urging that we get to work as rapidly as possible. I am now officially informed that the report will be released, even to the press, on the 31st day of this month.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could we not wait 2 weeks, until we get the report and determine what is to be done? According to the budget proposed on page 3 of the report, a quarter of a million dollars is asked. There will be a general counsel, 2 assistant counsels, 3 attorneys, 5 attorney-investigators, and so forth. In all there will be 11 attorneys, according to the budget which is presented.

Then, in accordance with the practice followed in connection with similar budgets, there must be editorial, economic, and statistical forces. There must be an editorial director and an assistant editorial director, an economist, and so forth. Why not wait until the report is made, so that we can determine the amount of work necessary to be done? A delay of 2 weeks certainly would do no harm. I am sure the Senate would then be in a better position to determine the amount of money necessary than it is at this time, in anticipation of the report being made, as the Senator indicates. It may be that the report will not be made on March 31. I do not know, but as soon as it is made, the Senate can take up the subject in the light of the work to be done, and act upon the report more intelligently. All I am asking is that action be postponed until such time as the report is filed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hope there will be no delay in voting on the appropriation. Five hearings have been held up week after week and month after month. There has been interminable delay, because we have not had any money to complete the various investigations. I hope the resolution will be disposed of today, and that the appropriation requested will be approved.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that Calendar No. 53, Senate Resolution 61, which is the pending business, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 55, Senate Resolution 63, to which I understand there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, am I to understand that we are to pass over the antimonopoly resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Only temporarily.

Mr. LANGER. Will it be taken up again this afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 63), providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendmendts, on page 1, line 6, after "Judiciary" to strike out "under S. Res. 245 of the 82d Congress"; and in line 10, after "Judiciary," to insert "or any subcommittee thereof," so as to make the resolution read:

> *Resolved,* That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified

by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $58,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] care to make any comments on Senate Resolution 63?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a few questions with regard to this resolution.

As I understand, this committee was created during the 82d Congress. Is this the resolution relating to the Trading With the Enemy Act?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that a report was made last year containing a résumé of all the hearings which had been previously held, and that certain recommendations were made to the Congress. I understand that pursuant to those recommendations a bill was introduced during the previous session of Congress, but because of the lateness of its introduction it was not considered. I understand that a similar bill was introduced during the present Congress.

The question I wish to ask is this: Since the subcommittee has made its studies and has indicated what should be done, and since those in charge of this subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee have introduced a bill to carry out the recommendations of the committee, what is the necessity for further hearings?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to answer the Senator from Louisiana by saying that he has referred to only one bill which was introduced in connection with the Trading With the Enemy Act. I hold in my hand copies of many bills which have been introduced. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that there is a problem involving between half a billion and a billion dollars' worth of property which is tied up in one way or another. There are involved also copyrights and patents and a great many other things, which take a great deal of time and study.

I see on the floor of the Senate the former chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He will verify the statement that there is a great deal of work involved. I am a little doubtful that the small amount we are requesting will be sufficient. When I went before the full committee, it interrogated me as to whether the small amount would be sufficient with which to do the work that is necessary to be done in connection with this subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to respond to my distinguished friend from Louisiana. As the former chairman of the subcommittee, I should like to say that the Senator from Louisiana is exactly correct. An omnibus bill was introduced as a result of the efforts of that subcommittee. I may say that a rather substantial amount of money, which was not expended by the subcommittee, was returned to the Treasury, because the subcommittee operated on a very frugal basis.

Since that time, an entirely new factor has come into the picture. Within the past 30 days a delegation of personal emissaries of Chancellor Adenauer arrived at the State Department. Conversations were held in the State Department. A release was issued by the State Department, in which it was indicated that a wholly different type of bill would be introduced. In the bill the cutoff of restitution will be $10,000 for each individual private claim, and $10,000 for each individual private claim in excess of that amount.

That brings into focus an entirely new factor; first, the amount of money that will be involved and, second, how it will be financed, whether by reparations from one side to the other. There is, after all, a very tricky budget problem which presents itself. Therefore, that is an entirely new development which has come about within the past 30 days.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the report is erroneous when it states that based on recommendations previously made by the committee which was created last year, during the 83d Congress, a bill was introduced in order to carry out the recommendations made by the committee. That is the same bill that was introduced verbatim this year. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that something has developed since that time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And am I correct in my understanding that that requires more hearings?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I should like to explain the matter a little further. The subcommittee proceeded on the theory that complete restitution should be made, on the ground that we ought to revert to the so-called custodial principle in connection with alien property, rather than confiscation, which was written into the act in 1942. On that principle the subcommittee proceeded and introduced an omnibus bill. It envisioned, of course, complete restitution of the property. Since that time a release from the State Department indicated that the Department did not intend to go that far, and that it would prefer to work out the problem on the basis of limited restitution. That caused the development of some new facets.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder why that was not known before. Why was it not brought up before when the committee was created last year or the year before?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The suggestion was made, but no formal action was proposed to the committee at the time. Speaking as the former chairman, I still feel the subcommittee was correct in going back to the custodial principle, because that has been the policy of this Government from the time of the founding of the Republic to 1942. However, other agencies of Government take a different view. I was not a party to the conferences at the State Department. I was not a party to whatever messages were sent to Chancellor Adenauer in Germany. Germany is the principal country in interest at the present time.

An additional problem, therefore, has developed.

Inasmuch as millions of dollars are involved, certainly $58,000 is a very modest sum for prospecting the matter in order to determine what can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 63), as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES FROM WESTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 56, Senate Resolution 64.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 64) extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "Judiciary", to strike out "under Senate Resolution 326 of the Eighty-second Congress"; and in line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Emigration of Refugees and Escapees" and insert in lieu thereof: "Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a thorough and complete study, survey, and investigation of the problems in certain Western European nations created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems

advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $36,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 64), as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 57, Senate Resolution 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 65) to authorize an investigation of national penitentiaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "or", to strike out "the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries" and insert "any subcommittee thereof", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to national penitentiaries, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $13,600, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year the Judiciary Committee received $5,000, and this year the committee is asking for $13,600. What has been done by this committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the committee is asking for a total of $8,600. There is on hand a balance of $3,600. That amount, with the $5,000 now requested, makes a total of $8,600, instead of $13,600 as the Senator suggests.

Mr. ELLENDER. The resolution, on page 2, in section 2, states:

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $13,600, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We are asking for an additional $5,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator wish to amend the resolution to that effect? The resolution requests more than $13,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would make it $8,672.79.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to amend the resolution by substituting for "$13,600" the figures "$8,672.79."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, first, on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 65), as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 58, Senate Resolution 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 66) to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask that a statement I have prepared be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

Senate Resolution 66, which provides $102,000 additional funds to the Committee on the Judiciary for an 11-month period beginning March 1, 1955, is needed to maintain the standing Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization. The subcommittee has been maintained exclusively by funds provided by special resolutions since the 2d session of the 81st Congress.

Since the beginning of the 80th Congress, which was the first Congress operating under the Legislative Reorganization Act, there has been a substantial and ever-increasing workload on the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee.

The number of private immigration and naturalization bills referred by the Senate has progressively increased from 58 in the 78th Congress to 1,958 in the 83d Congress.

Of the 1,958 private immigration and naturalization bills which were referred to the subcommittee during the 83d Congress, 1,694 were disposed of, 1,001 of which number were reported favorably to the Senate by the full Judiciary Committee and 693 were indefinitely postponed. The remaining 264 includes 64 bills recommended for approval by the subcommittee and 20 recommended for indefinite postponement, which bills were not acted on by the full Judiciary Committee prior to adjournment.

Many private bills are indefinitely postponed because the committee has a general policy of disapproving private bills in cases in which an administrative remedy appears to be available. In this type of case the staff assists the Senator's office in working out the administrative remedy for the alien involved.

There were referred to the subcommittee 29 general immigration and naturalization bills during the 83d Congress; 18 of these bills were disposed of, 9 of which number were reported favorably to the Senate by the full Judiciary Committee and 9 were indefinitely postponed. At the time the Congress adjourned, there remained 11 general immigration and naturalization bills pending before the subcommittee.

The new Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 414) became effective on December 24, 1952; and in order to assure fair and effective interpretation and administration of the new act, considerable work hours of the staff have been and will be utilized in conference with administrative enforcement officials of the executive branch, in research, and in the study of rules and regulations and administrative interpretations.

It is necessary for the subcommittee staff to maintain continuous liaison with the various branches of the executive departments concerned with the administration of the immigration and nationality laws and it is expected that numerous, informal sessions and conferences will be held, as in the past, between members of the staff and officials of the Visa Office and the Passport Office of the Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Board of Immigration Appeals concerning administrative problems in the enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act and other immigration and nationality laws. Members of the staff of the subcommittee consult daily with other senatorial staff members in connection with problems arising under the act.

It is also anticipated that the workload of the subcommittee in this respect will be increased considerably during the current session of the Congress in view of the widespread interest in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the contemplated proposals to revise the act. Proposed revisions of the act have already been introduced in both the Senate and House of Representatives, and any consideration by the subcommittee of these measures, or any contemplated proposals yet to be introduced, will result in increased demands for liaison and consultation with officials of the Visa Office and Passport Office of the Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the United States Public Health Service, the Board of Immigration Appeals and other interested branches of the Executive Department. The subcommittee staff will also be required to devote considerable time to consultations with representatives of voluntary

agencies interested in immigration and nationality problems, members of industry affected by immigration and by interested members of the public.

The staff of the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee also provides service to the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, established pursuant to section 401 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

On August 7, 1953, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, (Public Law 203, 83d Cong.) became effective. That act provides for the admission or the adjustment of status of 214,000 refugees and orphans over a period of approximately 3 years. Considerable work hours of the staff have been and will continue to be utilized in connection with the administration of the act. In addition, it is anticipated that a substantial amount of time will be devoted by the staff of the subcommittee to a consideration of proposed revisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

In addition, the subcommittee has an extensive workload of referral items from Senators' offices and correspondence which cannot be statistically appraised but which necessitates considerable work by the staff.

The subcommittee also has a considerable workload of cases involving the adjustment of status of aliens in this country. Under the immigration laws the Attorney General is empowered to adjust the status of certain deportable aliens to that of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence through the procedure of suspension of deportation, but such adjustment of status is subject to affirmative congressional approval in certain categories of cases.

In addition, under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, a number of persons who have gained admission into the United States on a temporary basis are eligible to have their status adjusted to permanent residence. Each of these cases is subject to affirmative congressional approval by action similar to the action taken in certain of the suspension of deportation cases.

At the beginning of the 83d Congress there were pending in the committee 4,092 cases involving the adjustment of the status of deportable aliens under the suspension of deportation procedure. To that number of pending cases were added 7,855 additional cases which were submitted during the 83d Congress, making a total of 11,947 cases. Of the total number of cases pending before the subcommittee in the 83d Congress, 9,949 were approved, 129 were withdrawn by the Attorney General and 1,347 cases expired, leaving 522 cases "in process" at the time of adjournment of the Congress.

At the beginning of the 83d Congress there were pending in the subcommittee 876 cases involving applications for adjustment of status under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended. To that number were added 2,507 additional cases, making a total of 3,383 cases.

Of the total number of cases referred, 2,697 were approved; 9 were withdrawn by the Attorney General; 195 were not approved; 8 were held for further information; and 474 have not yet been considered.

The Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, became effective on August 7, 1953, and to date there have been referred to the subcommittee only 36 cases involving applications for adjustment of status under section 6 of the act. However, it is anticipated that the volume of such cases referred to the subcommittee will increase substantially during the current session of the Congress.

The present subcommittee staff consists of 6 staff members and 4 stenographers. As previously pointed out, the instant resolution provides for a sum of $102,000 to operate the subcommittee during the current period as compared to the sum of $87,000 provided during the last session of the Congress. The requested increase in the funds to operate the subcommittee during the current period, as compared to the authorized funds in the last session of the Congress, is based upon an anticipated increase in the volume of work necessitating additional professional, administrative and clerical services. It is contemplated that a consideration of proposed revisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act will result in extensive investigations and hearings, thereby substantially increasing the workload of the subcommittee. Such activity by the subcommittee will necessarily result in increased demands for liaison and consultation with officials of the Visa Office and Passport Office of the Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Board of Immigration Appeals, the United States Public Health Service and other interested branches of the Executive Department, in addition to the normal activities of the subcommittee staff. It may also be anticipated that conferences with private organizations, individuals, and industry interested in revisions of the act will impose additional demands upon the subcommittee staff. Any consideration of proposals to revise the Immigration and Nationality Act will require an increase in the emphasis on the research functions of the subcommittee staff with the necessary staffing for that purpose. In addition, the increasing number of private immigration bills referred to the subcommittee, with requests for hearings in connection therewith in many cases, has contributed to the increase in the volume of work performed.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I believe that the funds provided by Senate Resolution 66, as reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, are amply justified and represent the bare minimum required to operate properly the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization for the period covered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand the amount being asked for is to carry on the work of the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee. As I understand, the committee is charged with the duty of investigating all the bills on that subject which are introduced in the Senate.

Mr. KILGORE. That is a part of the committee's duty. We have to pass also on all the deferrals of deportation. This year the Bureau has asked us to make a further study of immigration laws to see if we cannot eliminate some of this work.

Mr. ELLENDER. I noticed that during the last session of the Congress the amount requested was much smaller.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee is now asking for $102,000.

Mr. KILGORE. In 1953 the amount was $97,000. Last year it was $87,000. Last year Congress adjourned a little sooner than had been anticipated, and naturally the amount of work was cut down, but we have a backlog at this time which was piled up during the interim.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the committee really need $102,000?

Mr. KILGORE. We cannot function without it. If any money can be saved, I can assure the Senator from Louisiana that it will be saved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 66) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, insofar as they relate to immigration and naturalization, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending on January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistance, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $102,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

STUDY OF NARCOTICS PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 59, Senate Resolution 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 67) to authorize a study of the narcotics problem in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, this is a resolution for the creation of a brand new subcommittee.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. May I make a slight correction? The subcommittee was created to study improvements in the Criminal Code.

Mr. DANIEL. I interpreted the Senator's question as referring to a brand new job rather than to a new committee. I was in error in saying that it is a new committee. It is a new job which is given to the committee which was created to study improvements in the criminal code.

Mr. ELLENDER. How was the former subcommittee sustained? Did it work from regular funds made available to it?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes. This is a new assignment to the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. This means that in addition to certain professionals, the subcommittee will require the services of six professionals aside from those the committee now has. Will this entail the services of other professionals than the ones the committee is now using?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes. This will entail the employment of 1 general counsel, 1 investigator, and 1 clerical assistant to carry on the work of a complete investigation of the narcotics problem in the United States. I doubt if any investigation of a problem so large and of legislation already introduced in connection with it can be conducted for less than the amount recommended.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not questioning that fact, I will say to my good friend from Texas. I am only trying to find out why it is necessary to provide this money to carry on in the future the work which I understand has been carried on in the past by the regularly employed experts.

Mr. DANIEL. No, not this type of work. This is the first time that any committee of the Congress has been organized to go into the entire matter of the narcotics racket and to recodify the laws and recommend some new laws to strengthen our attack on this nefarious business.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent will these studies duplicate the studies which were made by the juvenile delinquency subcommittee?

Mr. DANIEL. To no extent whatever. We intend to use the evidence which has already been gathered by the juvenile delinquency subcommittee, the Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee and other committees. We do not intend to duplicate the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the committee use the past studies in its work?

Mr. DANIEL. It will; but the studies already made cover only certain isolated phases of the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the narcotics problem in the United States, including ways and means of improving the Federal Criminal Code and other laws and enforcement procedures dealing with the possession, sale, and transportation of narcotics, marihuana, and similar drugs. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) the extent, cause, and effect of unlawful uses of narcotics and marihuana in the United States, (2) the adequacy, administration, operation, and enforcement of existing laws relating thereto, and (3) the additions and changes which should be made in the laws and enforcement procedures to prevent illicit possession, sale, transportation, and use of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and to combat the increasing narcotic addiction in the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to procure such printing and binding as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommitte, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1956.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 6. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 60, Senate Resolution 70.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 70) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand it, the resolution provides for a new committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. I wish to assure the Senator from Louisiana that we do not wish to employ any extra technical or professional employees. As the Senator knows, the President of the United States has submitted a certain recommendation with reference to roads throughout the country. The President appointed a Commission to deal with that subject. Others have a different idea of the situation; and inasmuch as there is involved a recommendation for the possible expenditure of, say, $20 billion worth of bond money within a period of 10 years, we thought the American people should know that the problems concerning roads in Louisiana, in the Senator's own State, for example, are entirely different from what the road problems are in Oregon, for instance, and in some of the other Western States.

I assure the Senator from Louisiana that I am with him in the position he takes. As a matter of fact, I am trying to get rid of some of the professionals on my committee. In many instances I think we have too many of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the Senator agrees with me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They do not vote for the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Texas, or the Senator from any other State; but they are always on the job with the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice, according to the budget submitted, that the special subcommittee will be provided with three engineers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what it says. I am willing to let the Senate amend the resolution. It provides for so many technical personnel, so many lawyers, so many engineers. I am willing to have that provision stricken from the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not opposing the resolution; I am simply trying to get the facts, in order to make the record.

I notice that it is proposed to pay stenographers a base salary of $3,720, and a gross salary of $6,481.67. Does not the Senator from New Mexico believe that if that is to be done by the committee, it will be an invitation to other committees to pay similar salaries to stenographers? Frankly I think the amount is somewhat high.

Furthermore, will it not result in having stenographers who work for Senators and committees make requests for the same amount of money?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I disagree with my friend. I would rather pay a stenographer a good salary than use some of the so-called technical experts on the committees. I mean that. But, as a matter of fact, I want to agree with the Senator. The resolution was drawn as a technical proposition. Whatever may be done, let us not cut down on the pay of the stenographers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from New Mexico agree to the payment of a salary in an amount equal to that paid by other committees? The amount provided in the resolution is far in excess of what is paid by other committees.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator will do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only will we do that; but I assure the Senator that there will not be any so-called experts drawing pay for doing nothing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 70) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; and (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 53, Senate Resolution 61, authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion is agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the motion to consider the resolution had not been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There seemed to be no objection. Is there objection now?

Mr. ELLENDER. The RECORD will show that the motion to take up Senate Resolution 61 was not agreed to, because I made the point of order, the moment it was called up and read, that it should be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the motion to consider the resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

Senate Resolution 61 proposes a complete and comprehensive study and investigation of the Federal antitrust laws. It should be noted that the basic law, the Sherman Act, is now 65 years old, the Clayton Act 41 years old, and the Robinson-Patman Act 19 years old. During this 65-year period, no attempt has yet been made by the Congress to survey the entire field of antitrust laws with a view toward a comprehensive revision and coordination of these basic laws. In past years controversy has arisen as to whether these basic policies may have become outdated. Because of the many differences of opinion about the objectives of these antitrust statutes, suggestions have been made by many sources that our antitrust policy be restudied.

Attorney General Brownell recognized the need for such a study on June 26, 1953, in announcing the appointment of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. The Attorney General's committee is expected to report its recommendations for revision of the antitrust laws to the Congress in the very near future. As the Committee on the Judiciary under the Legislative Reorganization Act has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the "protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," those recommendations will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration. The Committee on the Judiciary will immediately be faced with the task of evaluating and analyzing the recommendations which have occupied the attention of the Attorney General's 60-man committee for almost 2 years. Because of the necessity of reconciling conflicting points of view, extensive and lengthy hearings on these recommendations are contemplated.

Questions have been raised in many quarters as to the adequacy of the present-day antitrust laws in the face of the apparent growth and concentration of economic power in fewer corporations and the consequent effect on the consumer dollar as contrasted with the situation existing at the time of the enactment of the Sherman Act in 1890. In view of the fact that the United States Government is the largest single customer of business and industry, it has been suggested that a study be made of the adequacy of our antitrust structure with relationship to the Government's procurement program and its effect upon the small business of the country, and as to whether such large procurements are contributing to the growth of monopoly control, and a weakening of our free, competitive economy.

Questions have also been raised as to whether the legislative policies embodied in the antitrust laws, are intrinsically sound in approach, and whether the separate provisions of these statutes and their relationship to one another are sufficiently consistent and coordinated to effectuate a unified Federal policy of maintaining competition.

It is noted that there has been a concern in recent years by the Congress over the growth of mergers and a decided trend toward bigger business despite the amendment to Section 7 of the Clayton Act enacted by the Congress in 1950. This increase dictates a need for extensive study of the merger movement, its consequent effect on competition and whether such a trend indicates desirable or undesirable concentrations of economic power.

Criticism has been raised regarding the procedures and remedies of the antitrust laws. The overlapping of jurisdiction of Federal antitrust agencies, highlighted especially by the overlap in jurisdiction of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, has generated demands for Congressional action to centralize antitrust administration and enforcement in one source of authority, or at least to coordinate through a central agency the concurrent jurisdiction of the several Federal agencies.

These and many other questions that have been raised as to the adequacy and present effectiveness of the antitrust laws can only be answered by the investigation proposed in Senate Resolution 61.

In view of the tremendous technological progress of American industry since the enactment of the Sherman Act in 1890, it is imperative that a thorough review be made of the entire antitrust field in order to achieve such realinement of the antitrust laws as will determine an effective Federal antitrust policy which can be enforced vigorously, effectively, and uniformly to achieve the desired goal of competition in a free economy.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 61.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 61) authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I suggested a few moments ago, when this resolution first came up, I am certainly not opposed to a study of the antitrust laws. As was stated this afternoon by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Attorney General has appointed a committee of 60 persons in order to make a study of the antitrust laws, the same study, I am sure, which is now in contemplation. The report attached to the resolution states the purpose for the selection of that committee. What I was asking was that the resolution be retained on the calendar until such time as the Attorney General's report may be filed.

Since the order for the quorum call was rescinded, I have been in conversation with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the resolution, reducing the amount which appears on page 2, line 22. I offer an amendment to strike the amount "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have action on the amendment, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 61), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand from the conversation I have had with the majority leader, it is understood that no one will be employed by this subcommittee until such time as a report comes from the Attorney General.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 62.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Has Senate Resolution 61 been agreed to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It has been agreed to.

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 62, Calendar No. 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 62) to study juvenile delinquency in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "Judiciary", to strike out "under Senate Resolution 89

of the 83d Congress"; on page 2, line 6, to strike out "Subcommittee To Study Juvenile Delinquency in the United States" and insert "Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof"; and in line 10, after the word "advisable", to insert "including no more than $2,000 for obligations outstanding and incurred pursuant to Senate Resolution 49, agreed to February 4, 1955", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors, (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws, (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable including no more than $2,000 for obligations outstanding and incurred pursuant to Senate Resolution 49, agreed to February 4, 1955; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $154,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have a statement, giving in some detail what the special subcommittee has done up to this point, and what the plans for the committee are in the future. I do not wish to read the statement at this time, but I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

The Senate has before it today the Rules Committee's recommendation for an appropriation to extend the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. All of us, I am sure, remember the fine work the subcommittee did under the helm of the former Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Hendrickson). Seldom has a job captured the imagination and inspiration of a committee's members, and been more rewarding, than the job that we undertook 17 months ago. When the former Senator from New Jersey and I introduced identical resolutions calling for a senatorial investigation of juvenile delinquency, we had no pretentions about the job—we knew that it would be long, that it would be difficult, that it would be frustrating. We knew, or suspected, we would uncover some very ugly situations, situations that I, as a father, would wish did not exist. But we also knew that unless these situations were brought to the attention of the general public, the problem of juvenile delinquency would grow increasingly serious, something that our country, with its high ideals and morals, and its prominent place in the free world's showcase could not afford.

We on the subcommittee set an almost impossible task for ourselves. We divided the objectives of our work into three sections. First, we embarked on a factfinding mission. We wanted to determine the extent, the causes, the character, and the contributing factors to juvenile delinquency. We wanted to know how adequate existing treatment was and whether preventive measures were working. We wanted to know how effective Federal laws were, especially those laws relating to narcotics, the Youth Corrections Act, and treatment facilities of the Federal Government. Then we hoped to focus public attention, through our factfinding, upon the existing problems. Finally, we wanted to act upon the facts and recommendations we compiled. We wanted to help those youngsters who had already embarked upon delinquent or criminal careers or who had become addicted to narcotics.

To grasp the problem, we decided on a representative community approach. We went north to Boston, south to Miami, west to San Francisco. We went to the border town of El Paso, visited Indian reservations, and took a look in our own backyard, Washington, D. C. What we found wasn't pleasant to me either as a father or as a Member of Congress. Frankly, what I saw frightened me. I learned that as a parent, I could only partially keep my children from becoming delinquent, although this was an important part. Much of the remainder of the job had to be done by the schools, by the churches, and by the Government.

Here are a few of the things we learned.

We found a direct correlation between juvenile delinquency and narcotics. We found that young girls turned to prostitution to raise the $20 to $30 a day necessary to keep them in drugs. This week Narcotics Commissioner Anslinger confirmed one of our findings when he reported that racketeers are recruiting youngsters to peddle narcotics in ever-increasing numbers.

In New York we were told that there are an estimated 7,500 addicts in that city alone. Seventy-five hundred. In Los Angeles County, 8 to 9 percent of all children hauled into juvenile courts had contact with narcotics. In Denver it was found that from 80 to 90 percent of all Spanish-American boys brought into juvenile courts had contact with narcotics. And in Iowa, investigations revealed that 25 percent of the girls admitted to the State training school habitually used marihuana.

In California the narcotics problem couldn't be handled by local authorities. Across its border, in Tia Juana, every form of vice abounds, including widespread prostitution and wide-scale narcotics operations. Tens of thousands of youngsters from southern California pour over the border in search of this excitement. Local authorities are frustrated. They can't prohibit this traffic. To them, this is an international problem.

One border official told us he had no authority to arrest or detain any of the many minors returning to this country under the influence of narcotics.

On the basis of our study we were able to introduce legislation that would prohibit juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian from going outside the United States without a permit issued by the Attorney General. On another level, we proposed that the meager force of 260 men who compose the Bureau of Narcotics be increased to at least 500 men.

In further study of the juvenile drug problem, the subcommittee found widespread use of barbituates, better known to teen-agers as "goof balls." These drugs act as a stimulant when taken with soft drinks or alcoholic beverages, causing the user to lose all inhibition and control. The drugs are not harmless as many people believe. Continued use will cause an addiction more severe than narcotic addiction and requiring lengthy treatment.

Manufacture of barbiturates in the United States far exceeds any possible normal use of the drug. This year the subcommittee hopes to get at the root of the problem, the solution of which may rest in Federal regulation of these drugs. We feel that there is a pressing need for control on the national level through the interstate commerce power or the taxing power of the Federal Government.

In one area, the subcommittee was both shocked and shamed. We found that a tremendous amount of pornographic literature, aimed at the young and sexually inquisitive person, was crossing State lines with almost complete immunity. A loophole in Federal law allows this $300 million business to flourish next to the impotent Federal and local authority. Under the present law, this pornographic material cannot be shipped through the mails. But it can be easily and legally carried across State lines by automobile and truck. Federal legislation is now under preparation by the subcommittee to close the loophole in the law. Future investigations are planned to discover the extent of this disgusting attack upon juvenile morality.

In Chicago, the National Auto Theft Association told our subcommittee that from 1948 on the number of automobiles stolen by persons under 17 years of age has steadily risen. In 1952, 70 percent of all automobiles stolen, were stolen by boys and girls under 17 years of age. Such thefts involve a loss of millions of dollars to the automobile owners of the Nation.

Under the Dyer Act, children who joyride cars across State lines come under Federal jurisdiction. As a consequence our Federal Training Schools are filled with teenagers who took an automobile with no intention of selling it, but merely to have a "good time." This conduct, of course, is inexcusable, but the subcommittee wants to look behind the law and see if the Dyer Act is perhaps too severe in dealing with these joy-riding youngsters.

Other crime statistics cannot be as easily explained. During 1952, 37 percent of all persons arrested for robberies were under 21 years of age. This age group accounted for almost half of all arrests made for larceny and even 35 percent of all arrests made for rape.

Back in 1948, we thought the problem of juvenile delinquency was solving itself. In that year less than 300,000 youngsters appeared before the courts. But, in 1949, with the cold war in full swing and the Korean war right around the corner, the juvenile delinquency rate started soaring again. By 1953, 435,000 children were being hauled up before the judges. In 1954, the figure jumped to over half a million. Only 10 percent of this increase can possibly be attributed to the enlarged juvenile population.

By 1960, this country will have a massive population in the 10- to 17-year-old age bracket. If juvenile delinquency continues to mount at the rate of the past 5 years, almost 800,000 boys and girls will be called before a judge each year. It must be remembered that there are at least three juvenile offenders brought to the attention of the police for every child actually brought before the juvenile courts. And that only represents the juveniles who are caught or turned in. Yet, even on the basis of the first figure, the problem is one of immense proportions.

The growing seriousness of juvenile delinquency is also underscored by the fact that an increasing number of younger boys and girls are committing serious offenses. During each successive year since 1948, a larger number of persons under 18 years of age have been involved in such offenses as burglaries, robberies, automobile thefts, and violent crimes.

As a result of the intensive community studies, the subcommittee introduced S. 728 which will provide Federal assistance and cooperation to States in strengthening and improving their programs for the control of juvenile delinquency. The bill also calls for the establishment in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of an office for children and youth. A prerequisite for Federal assistance is the organization of a committee by the State to coordinate all the interested agencies of the State in combating juvenile delinquency.

While the Federal Government insists on this coordination, as a prerequisite for assistance, no such program operates or is now contemplated on the Federal level. Each of the several agencies interested in the welfare of our young people goes its own pleasant way. Our subcommittee is now working on a program which we hope will bring together these various agencies so that they may effectively combat the problem of juvenile delinquency.

There are many and varied conditions contributing to juvenile delinquency which cannot be corrected on a community-to-community basis. There are interstate and national conditions and problems, and to these the subcommittee gave its particular attention.

The problem of runaway children fits into this category. No one had ever thoroughly investigated this problem before, although an estimated 200,000 youngsters stray from home each year. Our investigations revealed that runaway children are often committed to State or Federal institutions because of the lack of means to return them home. For their youthful action and the State's lack of funds, youngsters acquire a lifelong record as a delinquent. Further investigation by the subcommittee proved that the cost of institutional care of these runaways often exceeded the cost of sending them back home. Your subcommittee worked out proposals for effective interstate cooperation. One of these proposals would assist the States to return runaway children to their own communities in another State. The second would provide for an interstate compact for the return of runaways.

I have mentioned in passing only some of the subcommittee's findings. Let me pause for a moment and detail a few of our accomplishments.

Seldom a day passes without the newspapers carrying an account of some new action by a city or a State to combat juvenile delinquency. The very fact that the Senate of the United States singled out this problem for special study brought the problem to the attention of local and national groups. By the time the community hearings and their results were made national conservational topics, the cities and States had set up commissions and agencies to study the problems which we had highlighted. In short, the publicity accorded our work by the sympathetic press was a long step towards overcoming some of the difficulties inherent in the complex problem of juvenile delinquency.

During the hearings it was forcefully brought home to us, time and time again, that there is all too often a decided lack of cooperation and coordination among the agencies which are trying to do the job. And this, Mr. President, is true both nationally and in local communities.

The subcommittee has tried to do something about this lack of coordination. We have, first of all, focused public attention on this lack of coordination not only through our public hearings but also through questionnaires soliciting advice on how better coordinated efforts can be brought about.

Some of the recent communications received by the subcommittee indicate that our efforts may be more effective than we had guessed. For example, we have had considerable testimony before our subcommittee concerning the need for the establishment by the Federal Government of a new organization which some of the witnesses called a National Institute of Juvenile Delinquency. Our subcommittee is giving earnest consideration to such a proposal. In order to get the best thinking on the subject, we sent out hundreds of questionnaires asking for specific recommendations on the subject—for pros and cons—on this proposal. Recently we received one reply from one city in which all the agencies had gathered together to discuss the questions we had raised. In compiling their answers they were led to see how their recommendations could be put into effect locally.

A few months ago, the subcommittee called together representatives of some 17 of the largest service, fraternal, and veterans organizations representing over 16 million persons. When these representatives gathered here in Washington we put our challenge squarely to them. We knew that these organizations were doing a lot to prevent juvenile delinquency. But we asked them to do more. And we asked them to coordinate their efforts in doing more. They accepted our challenge.

Just this month, here in Washington, these groups met and set up an organization to coordinate their efforts in combating juvenile delinquency. They were entirely realistic in setting up their organization. They fully realized the difficulties inherent in coordinating the work of many sovereign organizations. But they felt the problem severe enough to merit their attention and dynamic action. In this very quiet way, the subcommittee has gone to work on its task of doing something about the problems we uncovered. This new organization will long outlive this subcommittee. We have provided the stimulus, the rest is up to them. I am sure they will do a wonderful job.

At one point in our investigation we asked 18 leading national, public, and private organizations dedicated to the improvement of services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency to gather together. They all came. They met for a full day and gave us the benefit of their valuable advice and counsel on how national efforts of public and private agencies throughout the country could be harnessed together to pull in the same direction, to eliminate duplication, and to increase their effectiveness. Many of the valuable suggestions received from that group are incorporated in the subcommittee's recommendations for legislation and action. But one thing surprised me about that meeting. I was told that it was the very first time they had all gathered together. And they expressed the belief that even if nothing further came of that meeting the opportunity provided by the subcommittee for discussing their common problems, as they did that day, would prove invaluable.

We all know what happened when the subcommittee tackled the problem of crime and horror comic books. In a short time, by the publicity given our hearings and findings, one large manufacturer of the comic books dropped out of business. Then the industry set itself the task of cleaning up its own business. They appointed a czar to police the industry. The results of this action aren't clear yet, but their action, through the work of the subcommittee, is a step in the right direction. You will recall that several police chiefs had testified to us that many of the delinquents they arrested had learned their ideas on crime from these supposedly comic books.

When the Congress can obtain such immediate results on situations as bad as this one, then we can be proud. We have done the best that can be done: We have legislated without legislation and censored without censorship. To me this is the highest kind of order within a society, but one that is not often or easily obtained.

Here in the District of Columbia the subcommittee found a juvenile-court system that didn't measure up to the problem. The court and police took it upon themselves to clean up many of the faults revealed by the subcommittee's investigations. But, the subcommittee is prepared to introduce no less than six bills calling for specific readjustments to make the District Federal court system more responsive to the problems of juvenile delinquents.

The subcommittee hearings were largely responsible for an additional appropriation of $75,000 to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This money will be used for juvenile services. The money was appropriated on the suggestion and recommendation of the subcommittee.

In Philadelphia our hearings were responsible for changes in the procedure for dealing with juveniles before the courts of that city.

In North Dakota, under the expert eye of the Senator from that State (Mr. LANGER), we discovered that the facilities of that State were denied Indian children residing on reservations. The Federal Government had relinquished its authority and no one had stepped forward into the vacuum.

During the four hearings of your subcommittee in North Dakota a number of specific recommendations for remedial action were proposed by various witnesses. Some of these were aimed at improving the administration of existing programs. Others highlighted the need for legislative action by both State and Federal Governments. Still others pointed at ways and means of improving coordination among the tribal, State, Federal and other agencies and organizations involved in Indian affairs. The subcommittee is now taking action on many of these suggestions and is presenting legislation directed at alleviating the severe juvenile delinquency problem in this area of direct Federal concern. In the coming year the subcommittee will travel to the southwest to see if we can discover the extent and the cure of the problem of juvenile delinquency in this Federal area.

The subcommittee felt that Federal assistance should be given foster children. Consequently, we have prepared legislation that would allow a foster parent to declare the foster child as a dependent for income tax purposes.

Each year tens of thousands of minor children are deprived of parental support because deserting fathers move out of State. To correct this ugly situation we prepared legislation to provide for the enforcement of family support legislation.

Let me for a moment recap what the subcommittee has already done.

We have foscused national attention on the very serious problem of juvenile delinquency. We have discovered the weak links in the chain of juvenile delinquency rehabilitation. We have discovered some of the major causes of juvenile delinquency. We have brought these findings to the attention of both the layman and the professional in the field. We have provided Federal leadership for community projects. Communities all over the United States are now combatting juvenile delinquency * * * and it isn't costing the Federal Government one cent for the majority of the work being done. We have brought together Federal, State and local groups, made our information

available to them, and, in turn, took information from them. We have laid an institutional framework by which to attack this problem and by which to receive and transmit findings.

Most of all, however, the subcommittee has developed leads for further study and investigation. The community hearings opened the door, provided the research necessary to attack the major problems topic by topic. That is what we hope to do. This is the area in which the Subcommittee can make its major contribution.

The subcommittee's efficient staff, in cooperation with the members of the subcommittee have synthesized all the information our investigations brought in and we have come up with no less than twenty specific topic areas that need intensive investigation and study.

The whole area of juvenile courts will come under our survey. Testimony before the subcommittee revealed that the Nation has only 7,000 probation officers while a minimum of 40,000 is needed.

The subcommittee will seek the cooperation of various bar associations and juvenile court judges in exploring the practices of the juvenile courts with an eye towards promulgating a uniform law and correcting abuses of the constitutional rights of juveniles and their parents.

Out of these hearings it is hoped will come some idea of how a juvenile court could be effectively run, the size of a staff relative to the cases handled, how much time the court should spend in social study of the youthful offender before the trial, the adequacy of the probation supervision, the availability of clinical services and the extent to which they are used and the professional qualifications of the judge and staff.

Much work still remains to be done with comics. Interesting leads have developed from our original studies in the field. One publisher testified that by mistake one of his trays of addressograph plates bearing the names of 400 children was routed to a publisher of sex literature. His mistake was one of many such mistakes by others. Advertisements of a salacious kind have been received by juveniles as young as 9 years of age.

The subcommittee held preliminary hearings to inquire into the extent, if any, that the presentation of crime and violence on television may contribute to the delinquent acts of children. Because of time limitations the subcommittee did not hear the full story of the effects of television on children. Further hearings are needed to determine if there is a casual relationship between the viewing of crime and violence on television and delinquency, and, if there is, what role should the Federal Communications Commission play in combating this. The television industry need not fear that we are singling them out for special investigation. We hope to conduct a similar study with regard to the movies.

The overcrowded conditions prevailing in our classrooms are well known. This national problem was illustrated repeatedly in the course of the subcommittee's hearings. The subcommittee found indications that the overcrowding and undermanning of schools are actually a contributing factor to juvenile delinquency. We wish to further investigate this matter and also deal with the manner in which schools may prevent delinquency and how schools may deal with delinquent behavior and vandalism behind their own walls.

Preliminary investigation into the relationship between lack of employment and juvenile delinquency leads your subcommittee to believe that there is a correlation between the two.

Your subcommittee must also thoroughly and systematically explore ways and means of providing suitable part-time work experience under proper supervision for the schoolchild who desires it. We must look into the expansion of guidance services and curriculum, including a schoolwork program in the public high schools, and look into the possibility of amending the Wagner-Peyser Act to authorize extension of the facilities of the United States Employment Service for young workers and to make its facilities available for the employment, counseling, and placement of high-school graduates and drop-outs, and to provide funds to enable the States to develop services along the same lines. From the proposed hearings it is hoped will come a detailed plan for a national program that will help solve this problem.

The policies of the armed services with regard to juvenile delinquents is an area wherein further investigation and exploration must be continued by this subcommittee. First, we must consider the problem created by the large number of juvenile delinquents who are not eligible for the draft due to their internment and, second, the problem of the many youngsters between 17 and 21 years of age who enter the military and suddenly come under an adult code of justice. For a minor offense, this youngster can be dishonorably discharged and his entire life ruined. We have no answers to these problems, but we do feel that they merit serious study.

Treatment services and facilities, including detention homes and aftercare services were found by the subcommittee to be one of the weakest links in the chain of juvenile delinquency rehabilitation.

We want to discover if our present Federal institutions offer proper treatment and rehabilitation of youngsters once they have embarked on a career of crime. We know that most criminal cases are repeats. If we can stop crime in its first stages, then we can go a long way toward eliminating one of the worst blights on our way of life.

Testimony before your subcommittee revealed that over 100,000 boys and girls are confined to common jails, thrown in with hardened criminals and not afforded the attention necessary to keep them on the right track once they have stepped off the main line. We want to explore the possibility of establishing Federal Forestry Camps on a cooperative basis with the States. We want to investigate the entire unexplored area of treatment and responsibility for seriously disturbed children. A segment of delinquents, while not psychotic, is so emotionally disturbed that special treatment facilities are required. Responsibility for such children is not clear. This hospital type of service is very expensive. Federal aid may be indicated or legislation may need enactment so that two or more States will be able to share the responsibility and the cost of a joint hospital.

Through its studies, the subcommittee found an unexplored area for investigation. This was the area of the youthful offender. A youthful offender is a person above the age jurisdiction of the juvenile court but still under 21 years of age. J. Edgar Hoover reported that crime in this age bracket jumped over 8 percent in 1954 alone. The subcommittee hopes to conduct hearings on the extent of involvement in crime of youths between 18 and 21 years of age and examine the court procedures in handling of these youths.

We also wish to follow leads uncovered in the community hearings that girls in this age bracket are being furnished for filthy entertainment and prostitution.

One of the main areas of concern of the subcommittee is the tremendous gap between the dollars needed for and the dollars allotted to family welfare work, education, psychiatric treatment and research, police court, probation and parole work. This problem will be with us a long time. One answer, to our way of thinking, is to get the best we can for the limited money we have. In most instances those in the field are dedicated, if grossly underpaid, people. But, our preliminary investigation highlighted the lack of cooperation among these people and groups. In overcoming this we feel that the Federal Government should take the lead. Toward that end we hope to evaluate the programs of Federal agencies in the fields of employment, education, social service, law enforcement, courts, detention, and recreation. Also to be examined is the feasibility of extending the services of the United States Children's Bureau, the Mental Health Institute of the National Institutes of Health, the United States Office of Education, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, and other agencies directly connected with this problem.

The illegal sale of 20,000 babies for adoption represents another interstate problem. Teen-aged mothers are particularly susceptible to the unscrupulous operators who market babies like dresses. In the Miami hearings it was brought out that Florida laws were inadequate to cope with the problem. It was revealed that a doctor operating out of New York was controlling the black market baby operations in Florida. Only when interested citizens contacted the New York authorities were the doctor's operations stopped and he called to account under New York laws. It is this type of situation that we are out to correct. The subcommittee hopes to explore this entire field from the criminal violations in adoption to the legitimate adoption and care of the babies of teen-aged unmarried mothers.

The statement has often been made that slums breed delinquency. That isn't always true, but in a growing number of cases it is true. At least, bad housing is a contributing factor towards delinquency. The subcommittee would investigate the adequacy of the Federal program in slum areas and the effect of slum areas on juvenile delinquency in such cities as Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and New York.

I have only outlined part of the subcommittee's contemplated work and exploration. But, from these, I am sure you can see the trend and the importance of continuing operations. Already findings, recommendations and legislation are helping to solve a major problem of our time.

When dealing with human personalities, one should not expect miraces or tremendous changes in short periods of time. We know that we are in for long hard days and ugly information. But we also know that we are engaged in correcting a situation that affects the very lifeblood of our Nation—our youth.

Many of us are tempted to think of juvenile delinquency in terms of children will be children. I only pray that this were the situation. But 17 months of investigation and study have shown us that unscrupulous adults and skillful manipulators in the mad search for an extra dollar are subverting our children. We have seen that the social ills of our society, and the tensions of a world halfway between war and peace are contributing to the restlessness of our youth and to the delinquency of some. We know that bad housing, bad schools and bad rehabilitation systems aid the growth of juvenile delinquency. But we also know that solid study, careful and realistic evaluations, publicity, cooperation and skillful legislation can solve this problem.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Members of the Senate that if the requested appropriation is approved, the subcommittee will be conducted with dignity; there will be a very serious effort made to determine the Government's responsibility in the field of juvenile delinquency, and the requested amount of money will go further and do more toward alleviating a very distressing situation existing in our country today than will any other amount

of money that may be appropriated by the Senate.

Mr. President, the fact that increasing numbers of young people are coming into conflict with police officials—in other words, juvenile delinquency—constitutes one of the serious problems facing the Nation today. The number of juvenile delinquencies has been increasing every year. The statistics show that under the Dyer Act, which the Federal Government has jurisdiction to enforce, 70 percent of the violations are committed by young people under the age of 17; that 37 percent of all persons arrested for robberies were under 21 years of age; that the same age group accounted for almost 50 percent of all arrests made for larceny. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover states that there has been an increase in rape cases of 110 percent since 1939, and the percentage of juveniles involved is becoming larger and larger.

Commissioner Anslinger, of the Narcotic Bureau, has considered the narcotics problem among youths to be of such consequence that he has assigned one of his top investigators to work with the subcommittee during its investigation. He recently stated at a congressional hearing that peddlers of narcotics were using more and more teen-agers to sell their narcotics, because stiff sentences have taken some of the old peddlers off the streets. There are many other efforts by organized crime and by peddlers in narcotics to use young people to perform their criminal actions.

The work of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency up to this point brought the commendation of all the organizations with which I have come in contact in connection with its work. We have received commendatory letters and statements from various organizations, including civic clubs that have been associated with the subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a list of those organizations.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED IN LETTERS OF APPROVAL TO THE COMMITTEE

National Probation and Parole Association.
The Salvation Army.
National Council of Churches of Christ.
Chicago Police Department.
North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission.
Greater St. Louis Regional Women's Guild.
Utah Federation of Women's Clubs.
American Legion, Department of New Jersey.
American Federation of Labor.
National Association of County and Prosecuting Attorneys.
Young Women's Christian Association.
Whatcom County Farm Bureau, Lynden, Wash.
Holy Name Society, Gary, Ind.
Holy Name Society, Menominee, Wis.
Commissioner's Youth Council District of Columbia.
Crime Prevention Association of Philadelphia.
National League of American Pen Women.
Parker B. Francis of Puritan Compressed Gas Corp.
United Christian Youth Movement.
National Council of Catholic Men.
Board of Training Schools, Missouri.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think if nothing else had been done by the subcommittee other than to bring the two groups together the expenditure of the money would have been justified. For the first time in the history of this Nation all of the groups, of a voluntary nature, dealing with the problem of juvenile delinquency have been brought together, such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Knights of Columbus, the Knights of Pythias, and other similar organizations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of the organizations which have coordinated in their work in the field of juvenile delinquency.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SERVICE, FRATERNAL, AND VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, FEBRUARY 24, 1955

American Legion.
American Veterans of World War II.
B'nai B'rith Youth Organization.
Fraternal Order of Eagles.
Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
United States Chamber of Commerce.
Knights of Columbus.
Knights of Pythias.
Lions International.
Loyal Order of Moose.
National Urban League.
Optomist International.
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, 20 or more agencies, such as the American Bar Association, the Child Welfare League of America, the Children's Bureau, and the Office of Education, have been brought together to coordinate their work insofar as such national agencies are concerned. I ask unanimous consent that the list of those organizations be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGENCIES REPRESENTED AT MEETING OF NATIONAL AGENCIES, NOVEMBER 17, 1954

Administrative Office, United States Courts.
Advisory Committee for State and Local Action.
American Bar Association.
American Public Welfare Association.
Bureau of Prisons.
Child Welfare League of America.
Children's Bureau.
Community Chests and Councils of America.
Family Service Association of America.
National Association of Training Schools.
National Association of Juvenile Court Judges.
National Education Association.
National Institute of Mental Health.
National Probation and Parole Association.
National Social Welfare Assembly.
Office of Education.
Social Security Administration.
Youth Division, Federal Parole Board.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in trying to solve these problems, we have had considerable cooperation from Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Her Department has been most helpful. I read now what she said recently about the work the committee has been doing:

> In seeking, as you have, facts and opinions from many sources, you have helped the Nation, both to grasp the intricacies of this social sickness and to think constructively about methods that must be devised and used in dealing with it.
>
> The public service you are rendering in this way is in my judgment of the highest order.
>
> I do not know of any other peacetime problem of our society that is more important, nor which, as the President has said, is more "filled with heartbreak."

Furthermore, Mr. President, the President of the United States—for the first time, so far as I know, in any state of the Union message—has requested that special consideration be given this problem.

The committee has made headway in getting the publishers of horror and so-called "comic" books—of which approximately 25,000,000 have been published every month—to clean their own house; but there are still some problems in connection with that part of the publishing industry, including the question of how the matter is to be looked into, whether the cleanup is working, and whether such publishers have a tie-in with distributors, so that many of the newsstands have been forced to sell such publications for the reading of children.

We have made some investigation of the distribution of pornographic material—the slime which has reached the proportions of a business of from $100 million to $300 million. That is an outrageous business. We have under consideration a bill, which has just been reported to the Senate, which will plug a loophole in connection with dealings in material of that kind; and we think the bill will be of substantial help in correcting that situation. Other hearings are to be held in connection with it.

Mr. President, I do not know how much longer the Senate wishes me to discuss the 15 or 16 items which either have not yet been dealt with at all in the course of our investigations up to the present time, or have been dealt with only partially. They include such matters as the operation of the Youth Correction Act. It is shameful that in many States, youths are thrown into jail with hardened criminals. There is a great deal of interest in the Federal Youth Correction Act, but it is not operative everywhere.

We have not had an opportunity to investigate the facilities in connection with the treatment of narcotic addicts. We have not been able to make a study of some angles of the problem of the use of narcotics by youths.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the Senator from Tennessee say that, in general, the resolution provides for a continuation of the study which was carried on by the former Senator from New Jersey, the distinguished Bob Hendrickson?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; the resolution provides for a continuation of that study. Senator Hendrickson did a great deal of good by the investigation he conducted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is my observation that in his studies in the District of Columbia, he was very helpful in exposing some situations which should have been exposed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree. Most of the hearings held up to this time have been held by Senator Hendrickson; and everywhere the hearings were held, a great deal of good was done.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know that at a subsequent point on the calendar, there is listed Calendar No. 59, Senate Resolution 67, to authorize a study of the narcotics problem in the United States. Can the Senator from Tennessee tell us whether the study in connection with that resolution and the study in connection with the other resolution would involve any duplication of work?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that there will be no duplication. The study called for by Senate Resolution 67 is to be made from a different angle. Furthermore, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] relates to a recodification of all the narcotics laws.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have that point made clear for the RECORD; because if we were to judge from the titles of the resolutions, that question would naturally arise in one's mind.

Certainly the resolution the Senator from Tennessee has been discussing should be agreed to. I agree with him that the entire field needs to be studied, particularly as regards the sale of some of the reading material to which he has alluded.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, we now have pending before the committee some 10 or 12 bills which have been introduced, to date, as a result of the committee's hearings. We have some 14 or 15 recommendations which have not yet been put into the form of legislative proposals, but will be put into that form in the very near future.

Several pending resolutions call for investigation of a very iniquitous situation; namely, the so-called trade or racket in the adoption of children. The committee has some information about that matter, which relates to the actual selling of babies. That has been condemned in many places.

Furthermore, the committee has a great deal of work to do in connection with problems relating to juvenile delinquency among Indians on the reservations. The committee has held some hearings, and much good has been done in that field. The other day the committee had a hearing on that problem, which is a very substantial one.

The committee has held hearings on a great many complaints about certain types of television programs. The committee has monitored some television programs, and has tried to work out the problem in conjunction with the Federal Communications Commission.

There is also the problem of employment opportunities for youths, particularly in the case of young persons who are out of high school but who, under some of the labor laws, cannot obtain employment. That is another matter that is being taken up by the committee.

The whole problem of the juvenile courts has not been investigated.

The committee has some investigations going on, Mr. President, in connection with a bill—which has been introduced—to make it possible to encourage foster homes for young people. There are a great many runaway children. The committee has made some investigations in connection with that problem, and wishes to make more, so as to determine what can be done in the case of runaway children, and how they can be returned to their homes.

Mr. President, I may say that as a result of the investigations conducted by the committee, or substantially as a result thereof, all over the United States committees have been formed; civic clubs have created interest in the necessity of taking action concerning juvenile deliquency; and various States have formed juvenile-deliquency study groups or committees. Not only that, but through our committee the Federal Government has been furnishing leadership and encouragement in connection with the attempt to deal in an adequate way with that problem. Approximately 35,000 copies of the committee's last interim report, entitled "The Comic Book and Juvenile Delinquency," have been sent out. I have before me at this time a copy of the report. The demand for additional copies of it has been tremendous, and has come from all over the Nation. As a result of the attention which, by means of the circulation of the committee's report, has been focused on the problem, parents all over the Nation have risen up in indignation and have demanded that the newsstands stop selling some of the so-called comic books.

I assure the Senate that this will be an unsensational, serious study. The plan is to ask the five members of the subcommittee each to hold hearings on some subject matter, either here or wherever they can be arranged. I am certain the Senator from Louisiana will be pleased with the work which we propose to do in connection with this problem, which he knows to be very serious.

A couple of days ago I received a letter from a young priest who has been working with children for a number of years, and has been one of our advisers and consultants. We have seen a great deal of him. His name is Father Daniel Egan, and he writes from Garrison, N. Y. The last paragraph of his letter reads as follows:

> Again, God bless you with zeal and courage in the work you are doing. It is the most important work that faces the Senate today if America is to remain strong for the future. It is the biggest test you've ever faced. I pray that you face it and pass it successfully—for the good of America's youth.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in my opening statement this afternoon I pointed out that the original subcommittee to study juvenile delinquency was created in 1953. At the time of its creation the Senate had the solemn promise of the Senator who originally headed the subcommittee that the money asked for would be sufficient to make a study of this question and that a report would be forthcoming, at or before the time stipulated in the resolution.

The time finally came for this subcommittee to obtain more money in order to carry on its work, in spite of the fact that Senator Hendrickson stated, when the committee was first organized, that the $45,000 then appropriated to pay the expenses of the committee would be sufficient.

Later, as I pointed out last year, the Senator came back to the Senate and asked not for $45,000, but $175,000, in order to carry on the hearings. At that time, when the Senate resolution came up, there appeared in the Washington Daily News of January 21, 1954, an editorial entitled "So Now We Know." It reads as follows:

> SO NOW WE KNOW
>
> Having done relative little with the first $45,000, the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee now asks for $175,000 more.
>
> The subcommittee started out to "paint a picture" of delinquency in the Nation. And to some extent it did. Now it is out to fill an entire art gallery.
>
> It is not entirely the subcommittee's fault that the "preliminary" excursion into delinquency has proved so little worthwhile. Senator Hendrickson and Senator HENNINGS have devoted much time and thought to the problem.
>
> But delinquency is perhaps the most amorphous subject that Congress has ever tackled. Furthermore—and perhaps this is really the crux of the crticism—the staff work has been, to put it as gently as possible, highly inadequate.
>
> The record, as now compiled, is a hodgepodge of testimony that adds up to confusion. Witnesses have been paraded to the stand without regard to the establishment of a comprehensive picture of any given phase of delinquency. Incidentally, the staffs of regular Senate committees set up hearings such as this one at a cost of a few dollars by making a few phone calls and sending out a couple of dozen telegrams.
>
> For the sake of overburdened taxpayers, we are prepared to make a deal. Let's all admit that delinquency exists, that all of us—parents, police, courts, schools, and citizens in general—have their various responsibilities in correcting it, and if the committee will bow out with the $45,000 it has already frittered away, The News will let bygones be bygones and refrain from saying, "We told you so!" which we did on November 17.

That, in essence, is about the same thing I stated to the subcommittee when it was first organized. I said that all that would result from this work would be a dramatization of child-delinquency problems. It is something that must be corrected, as I see it, in the homes and in the communities. Merely dramatizing the issue will not cure the evils.

As I pointed out this afternoon, the subcommittee made a report after spending $45,000. Another report has been made after spending the additional sum of $175,000 voted last year. That last report is now in the hands of the Senate. It contains recommendations of that subcommittee. I suggest that what the Judiciary Committee ought to do is to follow through with the recommenda-

tions made by the subcommittee, instead of continuing the subcommittee in existence merely for the purpose of dramatizing the issue.

I think this report indicates that practically every possible phase of juvenile delinquency has been looked into. Recommendations have been made in connection with each phase. The subcommittee has traveled to many of the large cities throughout the country, and on the basis of its investigations it found, of course, what everyone already knew existed. In addition, however, the subcommittee has suggested certain remedies. I say that now is the time to try to carry through the suggestions made, for us to act on the recommendations, and not to permit the subcommittee to merely continue to hold hearings and further dramatize the subject. Now, I say, is the time for action. We shall not begin eradicating the evils uncovered until we act—and the additional funds this resolution authorizes hold no promise of quick action; they portend only more dramatization.

I do not care to go into detail as to what happened to the subcommittee last year, but quite a disturbance was caused in the subcommittee when two of its staff members prepared a series of five articles which were published in the Saturday Evening Post.

Those employees received something like $15,000 for their articles. I understand that the chairman of the committee did not like it very much, and my good friend from Tennessee resented the fact that these two lawyers published the articles and were paid for them, in advance of the time the committee's report was filed. Why the committee did not stop the publication of the articles, I do not know. The fact remains that the articles were published, and that the two employees, in addition to the salaries they received for their work on the committee, received a $15,000 bonanza.

What is going to happen from here out? If the Senate gives the committee the $154,000 now asked, it will mean that the subcommittee will go over the same ground that the Hendrickson subcommittee covered. I presume there will be a little more television and a little more radio to follow the committee around the country. I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee, as well as all members of the subcommittee, will probably get quite a bit of advertising out of it.

And this problem needs no more advertising; it cries for immediate remedial action. If the amount herein requested were to be used in actually correcting some of the evils of juvenile delinquency, I would support it with all my strength. But these are not action funds, they are advertising funds.

In my humble judgment, the $154,000 will result in pure waste. My suggestion is a simple one. I stated from the very beginning, as far back as 1952, that some good might come about by dramatizing the situation. I agreed to that. However, to continue to dramatize juvenile delinquency without doing something about it will mean that we will spend this money and end up where we started. That is why I am opposed to any more money being appropriated for this subcommittee. I hope the Senate will agree with me. We have already appropriated for this committee over $200,000. The amount of money that is now being asked for, $154,000, will be just that much more money to go down the drain.

I hope the Senate will agree with me and vote down the resolution.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee at the time the special committee was created, and I am entirely familiar with everything the committee did. I was also a member of the subcommittee. The Senator from Louisiana, apparently, would spend more money for the cure of hoof-and-mouth disease than is spent for the benefit of the children and the youth of this country. If the distinguished Senator had taken the trouble to read the report of the committee he would be asking that the appropriation be doubled, instead of saying he does not wish any appropriation at all to be made. Let him go among the Indians. Let him go, as Mrs. Langer and I did, to an Indian reservation and see the want, the starvation, and the lack of education. I can take my friend from Louisiana from State to State and show him children 16 years of age who cannot speak a word of English.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my friend; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The investigation as to Indians has already been made.

Mr. LANGER. I beg the Senator's pardon. It has not been made.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has not read the report, then. He has accused me of not reading the report, but if he will read the report he will see that the study to which he refers has been made.

Mr. LANGER. A complete study has not been made. Of course, we made some study.

The Senator talks about dramatization. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and I went to South Dakota and North Dakota. We invited the Senators from South Dakota, and Representative LOVRE, of South Dakota, and the Representatives from North Dakota. We arose at 6 o'clock in the morning. There was no radio or television. We went to Fort Yates, N. Dak., and called a meeting at 9 o'clock in the morning, which is 8 o'clock at Bismarck, N. Dak. We stayed there until 11 o'clock at night. As the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will verify, we drove back to Bismarck, and arrived at 1 o'clock in the morning.

We went to another town and stayed all day at a hearing and returned to Bismarck at midnight. We left early in the morning for another hearing and stayed all day, arriving at Bismarck again at 2 o'clock in the morning.

That is the dramatization this committee afforded to the investigation of Indian conditions.

What did we find, Mr. President? We found on those reservations no law enforcement at all. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] appeared with us before the Secretary of the Interior, and we have been having hearings this week endeavoring to get some kind of law enforcement into the four reservations in North Dakota and South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did not the committee also find from its investigations that some States have certain provisions in their constitutions which will have to be removed in order to pass appropriate laws dealing with the subject?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. The constitutions of Montana and North Dakota require a constitutional amendment before they can take over the matter of law enforcement in order to protect the youth. The constitution of South Dakota is somewhat different.

Mr. President, this appropriation, in my opinion, is not one-third large enough. So far as I am concerned, I would vote for three times the amount requested.

Go to the State of Texas, go to El Paso. I wonder if my distinguished friend from Louisiana has ever been in El Paso, Tex.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been all over the country.

Mr. LANGER. Then he is acquainted with a hundred solid blocks of land claimed by both the United States and Mexico at El Paso. For many years both nations have claimed that territory. The only line marking the boundary between the United States and Mexico is composed of a few fence posts containing two rusty strands of wire. In those 100 blocks of property, consisting, as I understand, of between 1,500 and 2,000 acres, there are shacks. The people occupying them cannot get title to the property; they are squatters. The mayor of Juarez and the mayor of El Paso say they are helpless to enforce the law. Talk to those who have taken children by the hundreds and organized basketball teams and bowling teams, and they will make it plain that money is urgently needed in order to do something about juvenile delinquency in the United States of America.

Mr. President, we went to the boys' reformatory in Englewood, near Denver, Colo. In that institution there were 250 boys of the average age of 17 years. Go there and talk to them the way we talked to them and find out whether there is need to do something about juvenile delinquency in this country.

The distinguished Senator from Louisana says he has been all over this country. Then he knows better than anyone else can possibly know how badly we need this appropriation to help the youth of America.

Mr. President, I simply wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to stay here all night and all day tomorrow in order to get this appropriation to give the children of the United States the same kind of a deal we have given cattle and hogs and sheep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senate appears to have been indulging in dilatory tactics for several hours. I am willing to stay as long as any other Senator; but I desire to have a statement of the objectives or of what is being sought to be accomplished. In the last few hours there have been numerous quorum calls, but in each case the order for the quorum call has been rescinded.

I wonder whether the Senate has adopted new rules. I should like to have either the majority leader or the minority leader tell the Senate what may be expected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When the majority leader is dealing with 95 other Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Idaho, he is unable to anticipate what is likely to occur. In fact, with respect to the observation just made by the Senator from Idaho, the majority leader will say that he is just as anxious to get home as is the Senator. But the Senate has a legislative measure pending before it. A difference of opinion exists, as the Senator from Idaho must have observed. An attempt is being made to reconcile the different viewpoints and to keep Senators in good humor.

At various intervals during the evening I shall be glad to explain to the Senator any other objectives that may have developed in the meantime.

As I understand, the Senator from Louisiana desires to offer an amendment. If the amendment shall be offered, and if it be the judgment of the Senate that it should be adopted, then I assume the Senate will proceed to vote on the resolution.

If the Senate agrees to the resolution, the Senator from Texas will propose that the Senate recess until next Tuesday. If the Senate is unable to agree to the resolution this evening, it will be my intention to move that the Senate return on Monday. The objective on Monday will be the same as the objective on Friday; namely, to agree to the resolution in such form as may please the majority of the Senate.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that the order for the quorum call be rescinded? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I intend to offer an amendment to this resolution in just a moment, but I first want to remind the Senate that not 1 penny of the money which the pending measure contains will go toward actively eradicating the evil of juvenile delinquency. Not 1 red cent will be used to directly aid our children. On the contrary, the money contained in this bill will be used to pay salaries to a horde of professional investigators, lawyers, and clerks.

Reference has been made to the program directed at the eradication of the hoof-and-mouth disease. This program is not a costly one, Mr. President, but it is an action program. The funds involved go to actually stamp out the disease, not to merely investigate it, or dramatize it. I would be in full favor of increasing the money involved in the measure the Senate has before it if it were to be used to help our people actually and actively wipe out juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, I offer amendments, as follows: On page 2, line 8, to strike out "January" and insert in lieu thereof "July"; on line 9, to strike out "1956" and insert in lieu thereof "1955"; on line 19, to strike out "$154,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$125,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me see if I understand the Senator's proposal. On the basis of what he proposes, the report would be made on July 1, 1955, instead of February 1, 1956. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; on July 31, 1955. What I have in mind is to give the subcommittee, if it be necessary, time and funds sufficient to study further the report which has been made to the full committee and to carry through with the recommendations made by the subcommittee last year not to give the subcommittee funds with which to hold a new series of dramatic presentations and to again parade all over the country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to advise my colleagues, including the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, that I do not believe it will be possible, based on the schedule which has been planned, to hold all the hearings which the subcommittee has agreed to hold. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and I held a meeting in which this subject was discussed. It will not be possible within the time proposed by the Senator from Louisiana to hold all the hearings which have been scheduled.

Furthermore, it will be very difficult to hold hearings even on the basis of the reduced amount which has been asked for this year. Last year the committee asked for $175,000; this year the amount was reduced to $154,000.

Therefore, if the motion shall be agreed to, I think it should be known that, based on the schedule already planned, it will be necessary to return to the Senate before July 31 and to ask for an extension to enable the subcommittee to finish the hearings, and also to ask for additional funds.

I do not desire that any Senator shall misconstrue the present intention of the committee. I am confident the people of the Nation want the investigations to be made and to have consideration of the legislative proposals. Therefore, the subcommittee would like to be able to carry out its schedule.

If the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana shall be agreed to, it will be the intention of the subcommittee to ask for additional funds before July 31, and also to seek a further extension of time in order to enable the subcommittee to complete its work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 62), as amended, was agreed to.

RESCISSION OF ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, earlier in the session today, an order was entered that when the Senate concluded its business today, it stand in recess until Monday next. I ask unanimous consent that that order be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief announcement. Early this week, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader and the various chairmen of committees interested, I announced that following action on the resolutions which have just been disposed of, I would move to proceed to the consideration of the cotton bill, which has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Following completion of action on the cotton bill, it was intended to take up the postal pay bill; and following completion of action on the postal pay bill, it was planned to take up the classified pay bill.

I have had further conferences with members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also with the distinguished minority leader. Since it has been possible to conclude action on the resolutions tonight, I now propose to move that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until Tuesday, at which time I shall move to take up the cotton bill. It is planned to have the Senate proceed as expeditiously as possible with the consideration of that measure.

As soon as the cotton bill has been disposed of, I shall propose that the Senate continue with the schedule and take up

the postal pay bill and the classified pay bill.

Unless some emergency matters or controversial questions arise, that will be the order of business.

Mr. President, I have another announcement to make. When the Senate recesses, it will do so until Tuesday next, so there will not be a call of the calendar this coming Monday. However, I wish to serve notice on Senators, particularly the calendar committees of the majority and the minority, that a week from next Monday it is expected to have a call of the calendar from beginning to end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

AMENDMENT OF COTTON MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 50, H. R. 3952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3952) to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3952) to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, March 22, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate Friday, March 18 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Joseph Campbell, of New York, to be Comptroller General of the United States for a term of 15 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Merciful and gracious God, may we accept this new day as a great and glorious gift; a chance and opportunity for heroic endeavor and noble service; a call and challenge to build a social order that has in it the virtues of love and good will and the witness to a kinder and more magnanimous spirit.

We rejoice that, as we turn our thoughts toward Thee in the attitude of prayer, there comes into our hearts a sense of peace and power; the problems of life become less difficult to face and its burdens easier to bear.

Wilt Thou then constrain us to make a more fervent trial of the privilege of prayer and help us to believe that if we pray in ordinary days we will know how to pray with conquering power when the days of crisis and adversity come upon us.

Grant unto us an ever-enlarging vision of Thy greatness and goodness, for we humbly confess that we are frequently haunted by doubts and are tempted to become discouraged because the way is dim, the road is rough, and weather so stormy.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who is our refuge and strength. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5046) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 228), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act to lower from 65 to 60 the age at which women may become entitled to benefits thereunder. I believe this bill to be an economic necessity for married, single, and widowed women.

Two hundred and twenty-one thousand and two hundred and forty-two American women between 46 and 64 have applied for jobs in State employment offices. The married woman under 65 does not have enough to get along on even if her husband is receiving his benefits. If she becomes a widow before reaching the age of 65, she receives a lump sum of $255 from social security. The married and widowed woman is then put in the same position as the single women in this age bracket. She must seek employment.

Look at any want-ad section of any newspaper throughout the land. Very few employers are interested in women over 50. Yes; they must seek employment, but the bulk of women over 50 find the doors closed.

Reducing the age to 60 at which women may become entitled to benefits will cost 1 percent of the payroll costs. Gentlemen, these are our American women—our mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters. Compared to the sums of moneys sent to help other women throughout the world, is 1 percent too much to ask?

According to the questionnaire I sent to the 17th Ohio District, which I so proudly represent, 68 percent of my constituents favor lowering the age so that women receive benefits at 60. I hope and pray that my esteemed colleagues from the other 47 States will agree with our belief.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit this afternoon while the House is engaged in general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE WALTER SOOY JEFFRIES

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, with the routine of this new session of Congress now established and work well under way on some of the most pressing matters, I should like to pay tribute to a former Member of Congress who passed away while the House was in recess on October 11, 1954. I speak of Walter Sooy Jeffries, who served as a Member of this body from 1939 to 1941 as the Representative of the Second Congressional District of New Jersey.

His untimely death 5 days before his 62d birthday anniversary occasioned genuine and heartfelt grief in his home community, in his native Atlantic County, where he was widely known and highly respected, throughout the State of New Jersey and through much of this Nation where he had innumerable friends among members of the Masonic Lodge and the Shrine, in which he had long been very active.

His loss will long be felt by all who knew him, for throughout his adult life he had contributed substantially to the civic and fraternal life of the entire area. For nearly a quarter of a century he had been in offices of public trust and had dispatched his many official duties capably and well. And in the Masonic